



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Report**

**March 2008**

---



# District of Columbia

## FY 2007 Performance Accountability Report

### **Table of Contents** **(Chapters by Appropriation Title)**

March 1, 2008

<i>Contents (Appropriation Title)</i>	<i>Chapters</i>	<i>Page numbers</i>
Table of Contents, Introduction, Court Orders and Status Report	Preface	
Governmental Direction and Support	A	1 - 47
Economic Development and Regulation	B	1 - 42
Public Safety and Justice	C	1 – 43
Public Education System	D	1 - 10
Human Support Services	E	1 - 41
Public Works	F	1 - 19
Enterprise and Other Funds	G	1 - 13

Distributed by the Office of the City Administrator

---



# **District of Columbia**

## **FY 2007 Performance Accountability Report**

### **Introduction**

The District of Columbia Fiscal Year 2007 Performance Accountability Report provides the United States Congress and the Council of the District of Columbia with a report on the performance of individual District agencies and the government as a whole against established goals and performance targets.

#### **Report Contents**

Each agency's report includes the following:

- Goals: Priority objectives for all significant activities of the government of the District of Columbia
- Measures: One or more measures of performance for each Goal
- Managers: Name and title of the manager/s most directly responsible for achieving each goal during FY 2007
- Supervisors: Name and title of the managers' direct supervisor/s during FY 2007

Since FY 2001, the District has used a five-point rating scale for agency performance. A value of **1** through **5** is assigned to each Measure:

- 5** – Results are 105% of target and above
- 4** – Results are between 100% and 105% of target
- 3** – Results are between 90% and 100% of target
- 2** – Results are between 80% and 90% of target
- 1** – Results are less than 80% of target

Each Program's Measures are then averaged for an overall Goal rating:

**4.5 to 5** – Significantly Exceeded Expectations

**3.5 to 4.4** – Exceeded Expectations

**2.5 to 3.4** – Met Expectations

**1.5 to 2.4** – Needs Improvement

**0 to 1.4** – Below Expectations

No rating is assigned if agency data is not provided. Agencies submit data, on a monthly basis for most Measures, to the Office of the City Administrator. The City Administrator maintains this data, and as well as verifying the accuracy of calculations, ensures that no ratings are based on insufficient information. The District Office of the Inspector General has reinforced that agencies must be able to confirm the validity of all reported data.

The Government of the District of Columbia recognizes that the value of consistency in performance reporting is to allow one year's performance to be compared to prior years'. Data from FY 2004, as well as performance targets through FY 2008, are included in this report. However, the District is also aware that flexibility must be maintained when established performance metrics need optimization to, for example, guarantee that accurate conclusions can be drawn from the data that it is possible to collect; to more accurately reflect agencies' missions as responsibilities change; or to aid in agency decision making and policy formulation. Additionally, some Measures are designed to track progress toward the completion of only one specific task. During FY 2007, the Office of the City Administrator and appropriate Deputy Mayors maintained a rigorous review process for any agencies needing modification to existing Measures. Failure to achieve a target was not considered justification for abandoning a Measure. Although the vast majority of existing Measures carried over through FY 2007, some previously reported Measures are no longer present, while amended and new Measures are footnoted in this document. More detailed information regarding any Measure changes is available on request.

The Government of the District of Columbia is committed to performance reporting and management and is continuing to review existing Measures to ensure ever greater transparency, and that reported performance reflects the services provided to residents of the District.

## **Court Orders**

In addition to reporting performance results for District agencies, PL 103-373 mandates that the Performance Accountability Report include "[a] statement of the status of any court orders applicable to the government of the District of Columbia during the year and the steps taken by the government to comply with such orders" as required by PL 103-373. A report prepared by the District Office of the Attorney General is included.

## **The Role of CapStat in Performance Management**

Institutionalizing the infrastructure of performance accountability is the key legacy of the past eight years, and now the District realizes that more can be done. The new CapStat program will play a key role in drilling deeper into agency accountability at both the service delivery (transactional) and strategic levels. CapStat is a performance-based accountability program that uniquely identifies opportunities to make District government run more efficiently. The program is modeled after Baltimore's CitiStat but is tailored to the needs of the District of Columbia. The program that the Mayor has developed for the District offers a methodical process for relentlessly and repeatedly focusing the attention of government on improving performance in high priority issues that cut across agency boundaries. This process takes form in CapStat accountability sessions. For one hour, the Mayor and City Administrator bring into one room all executives responsible for improving performance on an issue, examine performance data and explore ways to improve government services, as well as make commitments for follow-up actions. Each District agency participates in the program. We look forward to sharing the outcomes of those efforts in future performance accountability reports.

## QUALIFYING COURT ORDERS IN EFFECT

The following report describes cases in which the District is operating under court orders that impose systemic programmatic requirements and over which the court has retained jurisdiction to monitor compliance. The District began reporting on these cases in FY 2000. Since that time court supervision has ended in four cases reported on in prior years:

- John Doe v. DC (Civil Action No 79-1726)
- Twelve John Does v. DC (Civil Action No. 80-2136)
- Pearson v. Williams (Civil Action No. 92-14030).
- Campbell v. Magruder (Civil Action No. 71-1462)

These cases are therefore not addressed in this year's report. In addition, the case of Bessey Neal v. Dir DC DCOC, Civil Action No. 93-240, which was included in last year's report, has been omitted from this year's report because court-ordered supervision has ended.

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
<u>Nelson v D.C.</u> (Civil Action 00-2930)	Consent Order requires that D.C. Public Schools take steps to insure proper emergency evacuation plans are in place for mobility impaired students.	Plaintiffs' motion to enforce provisions of a previous Consent Decree was denied after a hearing. The term of the Decree has expired, but the case is still open and DCPS is still maintaining efforts to ensure the safety of mobility impaired students. The case is currently inactive though it has not been dismissed.
<u>Joy Evans v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 76-0293)	Requires the District to improve the habilitation, care and treatment for mentally retarded residents and to timely pay vendors providing services to the class.	The parties agreed to an exit plan in order to achieve compliance with the court orders and end court supervision. However, while there has been progress in developing an improved agency infrastructure – appropriate policies and procedures, improved case management ratios, data driven budget, training, etc. – the plaintiffs have become increasingly impatient about not seeing improvements in consumer outcomes, particularly in the areas of health and safety. Plaintiffs filed a motion to find defendants in non-compliance with the Court's Orders and to appoint a receiver. In March 2007, the

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
		<p>Court found defendants in non-compliance with previous court orders, but deferred the remedy (receivership) phases. Since then, the parties negotiated a September 12, 2008, 90-day Court Order with certain benchmarks with which defendants achieved substantial compliance. The parties now are in negotiations with respect to a further agreement to address health-care reforms.</p>
<p><u>Mikeisha Blackman v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 97-1629)</p> <p>Consolidated with <u>James Jones v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 97-2402)</p>	<p>Summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs was granted long ago. Defendants were found liable for violating the rights of special education students under the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>, to timely hearing decisions and timely implementation of those decisions.</p>	<p>The parties submitted a revised proposed Consent Decree to the court in December 2005. At the conclusion of the fairness hearing to determine whether the decree provided appropriate relief to class members, the judge issued an order suggesting the decree was not sufficiently demanding of the defendants. The parties continued their negotiations, and recently submitted another further revised proposed Consent Decree. At the conclusion of the fairness hearing reviewing that proposal, the Court issued an opinion approving it. The Consent Decree is now in effect and is in the process of implementation. Plaintiffs have invoked mediation procedures under the Decree, and negotiations have resulted in a number of new side agreements, not part of the Consent Decree itself, calling for reform and reorganization of special education. The Court holds periodic status meetings to evaluate progress in implementing the Decree and the side agreements.</p>
<p><u>Nikita Petties v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 95-0148)</p>	<p>Relates to DC Public Schools transportation services to special education students and the timely payment of tuition and related services to schools and providers.</p>	<p>By agreement of the parties, a Transportation Administrator with broad powers to control all areas impacting on the timely transportation of students, including personnel, pay, and contracting functions is in place. There was a pending issue with respect to the power of the</p>

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
		<p>Transportation Administrator to enter into collective bargaining agreements and procurements without the consent of the Board of Education or the Superintendent. Defendants contended he must comply with D.C. laws and regulations unless specifically granted a waiver by the Court, while the Transportation Administrator contended he had the authority to act unilaterally. The matter was briefed and argued before United States District Judge Paul L. Friedman who upheld the position of the Transportation Administrator. . The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit affirmed the decision of Judge Friedman. The parties, under the supervision of the Special Master, continue to resolve payment disputes with providers of special-education services as they arise. The defendants' ability to exit from the litigation depends on their continued compliance with the various Court orders that have been entered and on the willingness of the Transportation Administrator eventually to certify that the transportation function can be returned to DCPS.</p>
<p><u>Oscar Salazar v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 93-2420)</p>	<p>Concerns the timely processing of Medicaid applications and re-certifications and the provision of well child and diagnostic screens under Medicaid.</p>	<p>The District has achieved a better than 95% timeliness rate for processing applications and re-certifications. The District has required its Managed Care Contractors to conduct significant outreach activities to increase the number of children receiving well-child care with good success. Data collection problems have hampered the parties' ability to accurately measure compliance with portions of the settlement agreement. Available information indicates that the District's EPSDT participation is among the best in the nation. However, the Court continues to monitor the District's</p>

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
		provision of services in this area.
<p><u>La Shawn A. v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 89-1754)</p>	<p>The Court's Modified Final Order establishes requirements concerning all facets of the Child and Family Services Agency.</p>	<p>On June 15, 2001, the Court terminated the Receivership. The Agency was in a probationary status until January 6, 2003 when the probationary period was terminated. The Court's substantive orders remain in effect and a phased plan to implement the Court's remedial order by December 31, 2006 was approved by the Court on May 15, 2003.</p> <p>The most recent report from the Court Monitor, issued in July 2006, measured progress with the Implementation Plan goals and benchmarks as of April 30, 2006. That Report found that the District had made significant progress in many areas and that measurable progress continues but that it was unlikely to comply with all required outcomes by the end of 2006.</p> <p>The parties negotiated and the Court approved an Amended Implementation Plan (AIP) on February 27, 2007. The AIP sets forth outcomes to be achieved by, and outcomes to be maintained through, December 31, 2008. The parties are seeking to negotiate a revised timetable and set of outcomes for coming into compliance with the Court's orders.</p>
<p><u>Dixon v. Williams</u> (Civil Action No. 74-285)</p>	<p>The Court's Orders address the operation of the District's mental health system and mandate development of a community based system of care.</p>	<p>On May 22, 2002, the Court vacated all Orders for receivership effective May 15, 2002. The Transitional Receiver was appointed to be the Court Monitor to track DMH's compliance with the exit criteria agreed to by all parties. The Court issued a consent order on December 12, 2003, which included agreed upon measurement methodology, performance levels and operational definitions for the exit criteria. The monitoring will continue until the</p>

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
		<p>Court determines that DMH has complied with the exit criteria. The Monitor is required to submit a report to the Court with regard to DMH's compliance with the exit criteria every six (6) months. In the January 2005 report, the Monitor found that DMH had made progress toward achieving a number of the exit criteria. On November 16, 2005, an emergency status hearing was held, based on problems with payments to providers of mental health services to DMH. The providers complained that services would be interrupted if they were not paid. A consent order was issued to pay approximately one-half of the outstanding balances owed within 48 hours of the date the order was signed. The payments were made, although all took longer than 48 hours. On February 3, 2006 another status hearing was held. The Court Monitor raised the following issues: 1) the physical plant of the Comprehensive Psychiatric Emergency Program (CPEP); 2) the staff vacancies at St. Elizabeths Hospital, the physical plant, and the accountability structure. The Court set a further hearing for March 28, 2006 and DMH provided, as ordered, a status report addressing these issues of concern. New payment orders have subsequently been issued, and payments to providers are being made in accordance with those orders. The Monitor is continuing to monitor the system and the defendants are cooperating with him in the process. In the most recent report of the Court Monitor, rendered in January 2008, he found that the defendants are making progress on all fronts. They have satisfied two of the exit criteria and are hoping to have satisfied about half by the end of this year. A new hospital building at St. Elizabeths is under</p>

Civil Action	Summary of Order(s)	Summary of Status
		construction. In December 2007, a study group on emergency psychiatric services rendered a comprehensive report which is in the process of implementation. The Court has expressed continued satisfaction with the progress that DMH has made and looks forward to the day when DMH can exit from this litigation.
<u>Jerry M. v. DC</u> (Civil Action No. 1519-85)	This civil action concerns environmental conditions, security, and rehabilitative services and programs that are available to juveniles at the District's secure facility for juveniles as well as in the community.	<p>On May 13, 2004, the Court (Dixon, J.) approved the parties' Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which stayed any action on plaintiffs' motion to appoint a transitional receiver. The MOA also appointed a Special Arbiter to assist the parties to develop a work plan to achieve compliance with the goals set forth in the Consent Decree, including recommendations for modification and exit-plan criteria. Since that time, the Court has approved several Short Term Deliverable Plans which have addressed short and long term goals.</p> <p>In 2007, the parties negotiated and agreed to a comprehensive work plan with measurable exit criteria from court-imposed oversight. The parties and the Special Arbiter envision that defendants should be able to demonstrate substantial compliance within 18 months to two years. In December 2007, the Workplan was approved by the Court.</p>

*NOTE: All actions listed above were brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia except for Jerry M. v. DC, which was brought in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.*

# FY 2007 Performance Accountability Reports' Status

## (Agency Chapters by Appropriation Title)

Code	Agency	Report Status
<b>Chapter A: Governmental Direction and Support</b>		
AB0	Council of the District of Columbia	No data; measures span fiscal years
AC0	Office of the District of Columbia Auditor	Included
AA0	Office of the Mayor	Included
BA0	Office of the Secretary	Included
AE0	Office of the City Administrator	Included
RK0	Office of Risk Management	No FY 2007 data submitted
BE0	DC Human Resources	Included
HD0	Human Resources Development	Included
AS0	Office of Financial Management	No FY 2007 data submitted
PO0	Office of Contracting and Procurement	Included
TO0	Office of the Chief Technology Officer	Included
AM0	Office of Property Management	Included; updated by OCA 2/15/08
AF0	Contract Appeals Board	Included
CJ0	Office of Campaign Finance	Included; updated by agency 2/15/08
CG0	Public Employee Relations Board	Included
CH0	Office of Employee Appeals	Included
CB0	Office of the Attorney General	Included
AD0	Office of the Inspector General	Included
AT0	Office of the Chief Financial Officer	Included
<b>Chapter B: Economic Development and Regulation</b>		
EB0	Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development	Included
BD0	Office of Planning	Included
EN0	Department of Small and Local Business Development	Included
TK0	Office of Motion Pictures and Television Development	Included
BJ0	Office of Zoning	Included
DB0	Department of Housing and Community Development	Included
CF0	Department of Employment Services	Included
DA0	Board of Real Property and Assessment	Included
CR0	Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs	Included
BX0	Commission on the Arts and Humanities	No FY 2007 data submitted
LQ0	Alcoholic Beverage Regulatory Administration	Included
DH0	Public Service Commission	Included
DJ0	Office of the People's Counsel	Included
SR0	Department of Insurance, Securities and Banking	Included
CT0	Office of Cable Television	Included
CQ0	Office of the Tenant Advocate	In transition during FY 2007
<b>Chapter C: Public Safety and Justice</b>		
FA0	Metropolitan Police Department	Included
FB0	Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department	Included
FL0	Department of Corrections	Included
FK0	DC National Guard	Included
BN0	Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency	Included
DQ0	Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure	Included
DV0	Judicial Nominations Commission	Included

<b>Code</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Report Status</b>
FH0	Office of Police Complaints	Included
FZ0	DC Sentencing Commission	Included
FX0	Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	Included
FS0	Office of Administrative Hearings	Included
FI0	Corrections Information Council	No FY 2007 data submitted
FJ0	Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	Included
FE0	Office of Victim Services	In transition during FY 2007
FO0	Justice Grants Administration	In transition during FY 2007
UC0	Office of Unified Communications	Included
<b><u>Chapter D: Public Education System</u></b>		
GA0	DC Public Schools	Included
GD0	State Education Office	Included
CE0	DC Public Library	Included
<b><u>Chapter E: Human Support Services</u></b>		
JA0	Department of Human Services	Included
JM0	Department on Disability Services	Included
RL0	Child and Family Services Agency	Included
RM0	Department of Mental Health	Included
HC0	Department of Health	Included
HA0	Department of Parks and Recreation	Included
BY0	DC Office on Aging	Included
HM0	Office of Human Rights	Included
BZ0	Office of Latino Affairs	Included
KG0	District Department of the Environment	Included
AP0	Office of Asian Pacific Islander Affairs	Included
VA0	Office of Veterans Affairs	Included
JZ0	Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services	Included
<b><u>Chapter F: Public Works</u></b>		
KT0	Department of Public Works	Included
KA0	District Department of Transportation	Included
KV0	Department of Motor Vehicles	Included
TC0	DC Taxicab Commission	Included
KC0	Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Commission	No FY 2007 data submitted
KE0	Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority	Included
<b><u>Chapter G: Enterprise and Other Funds</u></b>		
LA0	Water and Sewer Authority	Included
LB0	Washington Aqueduct	No FY 2007 data submitted
DC0	DC Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	No FY 2007 data submitted
SC0	D.C. Sports and Entertainment Commission	No FY 2007 data submitted
DY0	District of Columbia Retirement Board	Included ; updated by agency 3/5/08
ES0	Washington Convention Center Authority	No FY 2007 data submitted
GF0	University of the District of Columbia	Included



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter A: Governmental Direction and  
Support**

**March 2008**

---

## ***Council of the District of Columbia (AB0)***

**Program 1:** Enact laws, approve the operating budget and financial plan, establish and oversee the programs and operations of government agencies and set policy for the government.

*Manager(s):* Cynthia Brock-Smith, Secretary to the Council

*Supervisor(s):* Vincent A. Gray, Chairman, Council of the District

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Because no targets are assigned to these performance measures, no rating is possible.

Measure 1.1:	Number of public hearings conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Number of oversight hearings conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Number of investigative hearings conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.4:	Number of performance oversight hearings conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.5:	Number of budget review hearings conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: All performance measures are presented by Council periods, which begin on January 1 of odd-numbered years and are two years in length.

## ***Office of the District of Columbia Auditor (AC0)***

### **Program 1: Audit, Financial Oversight and Investigations**

**Manager(s):** Lawrence I. Perry, Deputy DC Auditor

**Supervisor(s):** Deborah K. Nichols, DC Auditor

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Office of the District of Columbia Auditor (AC0) met and/or exceeded all of the goals for KRMs under this program except for one. The overall rating for the agency in this program is "exceeded" expectations.

Measure 1.1: Amount of potential savings or increased revenue identified by Office of the DC Auditor (in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	10	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	105.5	22.8	-

Measure 1.2: Number of mandatory statutory audits

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	9	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	9	12	-

Note: FY 2007 target increased from 9 to 10 at agency request. (2/2006)

Measure 1.3: Number of performance, financial and compliance audits completed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	15	15	15
Actual	N/A	N/A	16	14	-

Measure 1.4: Number of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions that receive financial oversight and ministerial duties from the Office of the DC Auditor

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	37	37	37
Actual	N/A	N/A	37	37	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of employees indicating training helped them gain knowledge or apply new skills in performing their jobs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New KRM in FY 2006.

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

**Manager(s):** Earl Cabbell, Deputy DC Auditor

**Supervisor(s):** Deborah K. Nichols, DC Auditor

### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	80	-

## Office of the Mayor (AA0)

### Program 1: Office of the Mayor

Manager(s): Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff

Supervisor(s): Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

#### Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Mayor significantly exceeded expectation for the two measures presented below.

Measure 1.1:	Percent change in volunteers engaged through Serve D.C.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	10	10	10	10	10
	Actual	-12	34	53.5	243	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of LSDBE contracting target achieved.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	109	106	160.5	103	-

### Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff

Supervisor(s): Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

#### Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: The final baseline figures and FY 2006-2008 targets will be published in the FY 2007 Operating Budget and Financial Plan, due to be submitted to Congress in June 2006. Cost of Risk is a comprehensive measure of a wide range of risks confronting each agency, including but not limited to safety issues, financial risks, and potential litigation. (3/10/06)

Measure 2.3:	Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	77.8	54	-	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	83.33	60	-	100	-

## ***Office of the Secretary (BA0)***

### **Program 1: Escheated Estates Fund**

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary significantly exceeded expectations for the Escheated Estates Fund Program which has only one Key Result Measure.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of EEF applications processed within 60 days or within statutory timeframes, whichever is shorter					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	50	75	75	75
	Actual	N/A	30	72.22	95.04	-

### **Program 2: International Relations and Protocol**

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary met the target for the single key result measure in the International Relations and Protocol Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of requests for courtesy visits and meetings responded to					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	91.38	98.31	100	-

### **Program 3: Ceremonial Services**

*Manager(s):* Betty Akers, Chief, Ceremonial Services Unit

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary exceeded the target for the single key result measure in the Ceremonial Services program.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of requests for ceremonial documents responded to by request date					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

### **Program 4: Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances**

*Manager(s):* LaShonda Holloway, Director, Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary significantly exceeded two targets and fell below one target for the Documents and Administrative Issuances Program. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of regulations researched/reviewed/updated/compiled annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	33	35	40	35
	Actual	N/A	50	-	100	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of rulemaking notices reviewed in time for publication in the D.C. Register					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	-	95.14	-

Measure 4.3:	Percent of Mayor's orders/memoranda drafted and/or reviewed within 24 hours of submission					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	80	85	85	85
	Actual	N/A	99.47	-	100	-

**Program 5: Notary Commissions and Authentications**

*Manager(s):* Rosslyn P. Brown, Chief, Notary Commissions and Authentications

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary significantly exceeded one target and fell below expectations on one target for the Notary Commissions and Authentications Program. Overall, the agency met expectations in this program.

Measure 5.1:	Percent of completed notary applications processed within 60 days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	65	75	80	75
	Actual	N/A	100	100	46.13	-

Measure 5.2:	Percent of documents authenticated within the same business day					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	80	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

**Program 6: Office of Public Records**

*Manager(s):* Clarence Davis, Administrator, Office of Public Records

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Secretary significantly exceeded expectations the targets for for all three key result measures in the Office of Public Records Program.

Measure 6.1:	Percent of new temporary records available for access to DC government agencies and the public at the Records Center within 10 working days after receipt					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	25	30	35	30
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 6.2:	Percent of new historical records available for access to DC government agencies and the public at the Archival Center within 10 working days after receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	25	30	35	30
Actual	N/A	95.45	100	100	-

Measure 6.3:	Percent of agency record retention schedules reviewed and approved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	25	30	35	30
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

**Program 7: Executive Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Patricia Elwood, Interim Secretary of the District of Columbia

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 7.1:	Percent of legal appeals (FOIA) rendered within statutory response times				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	10	10	10
Actual	N/A	10.53	-	-	-

**Program 8: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Stephanie Scott, Secretary of the District of Columbia

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 8.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 8.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	29.6	37.5	-	-

Measure 8.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	84.6	61.54	82	-

## Office of the City Administrator (AE0)

### Program 1: City Administrator

Manager(s): Dan Tangherlini, City Administrator

Supervisor(s): Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 1.1:	Percent of agency key result measure targets achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	80	80	80
	Actual	80	73.3	65.6	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of agencies staying within budget	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of District agencies with Performance-based budgets	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	97	100	100	100
	Actual	80	97	100	83.15	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards met by agencies tested	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	47	46.7	33.3	-	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent reduction of citywide Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

### Program 2: Children, Youth, Families and Elders

Manager(s): Dan Tangherlini, City Administrator

Supervisor(s): Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Measure 2.1:	Percent of cluster agency key result measure targets achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	80	80	80
	Actual	88	69.9	65.1	62.7	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent of cluster agencies staying within budget	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of eligible children served by the OECD placed in subsidized child care facilities	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	40	40	65	65	70
	Actual	40	47.79	73.5	66.01	-
Measure 2.4:	Percent of case managed women in Wards 5,6,7 and 8 who entered prenatal care in the first trimester of pregnancy	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	78	78	78	75
	Actual	N/A	78	42	77	-
Measure 2.5:	Percent of DPR's 17 child development facilities that maintain national accreditation	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	90	90	100	100
	Actual	95	94.12	100	88.24	-
Measure 2.6:	Percent of seniors who seek employment that are placed in jobs	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	35	20	40	40	40
	Actual	46	41.42	46.5	52.88	-
Measure 2.7:	Percentage of children in need of MH services that receive MH services	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	3	5	5	5	5
	Actual	3	2.1	1.94	2.67	-
Measure 2.8:	Percent of investigations in compliance with 30 day investigation requirement	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	75	80	95	95
	Actual	54	60.84	61.7	85.5	-

**Program 3: Operations**

*Manager(s):* Dan Tangherlini, City Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Measure 3.1:	Percent of cluster agency key result measure targets achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	80	80	80
	Actual	75.64	75	70.2	45.9	-
Measure 3.2:	Percent of cluster agencies staying within budget	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of drivers' services visits completed within 50 minutes or less					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	85	N/A	80	80
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	94.72	-
Measure 3.4:	Percent change in the difference between the original construction schedule and actual delivery					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	-10	-10	-10	-10
	Actual	N/A	N/A	11.9	-	-
Measure 3.5:	Percent of DPW and DDOT scheduled services completed within established timeframes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	87	90	90	90
	Actual	83.85	86.9	93.3	-	-
Measure 3.6:	Small purchase average cycle time (days), OCP only					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	7.5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.98	-
Measure 3.7:	Percent of eligible employees with a performance evaluation completed on-time					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	85	85	80	80
	Actual	79.57	N/A	86.4	62.6	-
Measure 3.8:	Percent of traffic signals repaired in 24 hours					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	85	85	85	85
	Actual	93	93.92	93.7	98.61	-

**Program 4: Public Safety and Justice**  
**Manager(s):** Dan Tangherlini, City Administrator  
**Supervisor(s):** Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

Measure 4.1:	Percent of cluster agency key result measure targets achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	80	80	80
	Actual	73	77.8	62.3	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Percent of cluster agencies staying within budget					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	67.7	-

Measure 4.3:	Percent change in DC Code Index violent crimes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
	Actual	-13.5	-5.8	3.9	-4.3	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent change in DC Code Index property crimes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
	Actual	-13.7	-10.2	-3.4	-2.2	-
Measure 4.5:	Percent of ALS responses to critical medical calls within eight minutes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	73.3	76.26	82.26	89.39	-
Measure 4.6:	Percent of 911 calls answered within five seconds	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	95	97.5	97.5
	Actual	87.3	94.1	96	95.5	-
Measure 4.7:	Percent of Department of Homeland Security (DHS) funds obligated with subgrants awarded within the appropriate timetable	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	80	80	80	80
	Actual	80	85	-	-	-
Measure 4.8:	Percent of autopsy reports on homicide cases completed within 60 days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	60	70	80	80	80
	Actual	47	71.57	85.3	70.29	-

**Program 5: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Dan Tangherlini, City Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Adrian M. Fenty, Mayor

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	52.3	33.3	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	82.61	68.18	61.7	60.7	-

## Office of Risk Management (RK0)

### Program 1: Risk Identification and Analysis

Manager(s): Monique LaBeach Poydras, Chief of Staff

Supervisor(s): Kelly Valentine, Director

#### Program Result: No Rating

The Office of Risk Management has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Consultative program for safety, security and contingency planning for emergencies	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Compliance monitoring with risk control deficiency remediation recommendations	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	163	173
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Detailed loss analysis and related benchmarking and risk control strategy research	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	192	192
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.4:	Agency-specific risk control consultation relative to remediation and mitigation strategies	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	150
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.5:	Regular risk control on-site assessments, relative to safety, physical security and operational exposures	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

### Program 2: Risk Financing

Manager(s): Sharon Howell, Disability Compensation Manager

Supervisor(s): Kelly Valentine, Director

#### Program Result: No Rating

The Office of Risk Management has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1:	Oversee Claims Bureau management and processes for adjudicating property, liability and disability compensation claims against the District government	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Review claims summaries and management reports identifying trends and issues for follow-up	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.3:	Develop and implement appropriate risk financing alternatives for identified exposures	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	35
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.4:	Percent of contracts, agreements and leases reviewed to identify risk management implications	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	30
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Monique LaBeach Poydras, Chief of Staff

*Supervisor(s):* Kelly Valentine, Director

**Program Result: No Rating**

The Office of Risk Management has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	72.2	-	-
Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

## DC Human Resources (BE0)

### Program 1: Policy, Program and Professional Development

Manager(s): Daniel Hernandez, Jessica Pimentel

Supervisor(s): Brender L. Gregory, Director

**Program Result:** *Does Not Meet Expectations*

Measure 1.1:	Percent of PMP employees with a Performance Plan in place on time	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	87.09	89.29	63	70.41	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of eligible employees with a performance evaluation completed on time	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	85	85	80	80
	Actual	79.57	N/A	86.4	62.6	-

Note: Since data is collected after the official end of the rating period (9/30/07), and the final results are still being calculated, we are only able to report partial results for FY '07 at this time.

Measure 1.3:	Number of grievances per 100 FTEs	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: No grievances were reported to DCHR in Fiscal year 2007.

Measure 1.4:	Percent of grievances resolved before passing from management control	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: No grievances were reported to DCHR in Fiscal year 2007.

### Program 2: Personnel Operations

Manager(s): Levonia Williams, Karla Sumpter, Anh-Tuan Truong

Supervisor(s): Brender L. Gregory, Director

**Program Result:** *Meets Expectations*

DCHR began FY07 with new measures. Targets for these measures were developed during FY07 or will be based on FY07 data. DCHR customer service survey is anonymous and does not distinguish non-management employee from management employee. DCHR will modify current customer service survey to include check boxes for non-management employee and management employee for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Average number of calendar days to complete an external competitive recruitment and selection process	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	45	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	42	-

Measure 2.2: Average number of calendar days to complete an internal competitive recruitment and selection process

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	30	-

Note: The agency did not calculate the data on a monthly basis.

Measure 2.3: Employee turnover rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	14.26	-

Measure 2.4: Percent of non-management employees reporting satisfaction with human resources services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	95	-

Note: For Fiscal Year 07, customer service satisfaction was measured through anonymous surveys that were not categorized by management and non-management employees. For Fiscal Year 08, the customer service survey has been modified to include this requirement.

Measure 2.5: Percent of management employees reporting satisfaction with human resources services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	95	-

Note: For Fiscal Year 07, customer service satisfaction was measured through anonymous surveys that were not categorized by management and non-management employees. For Fiscal Year 08, the customer service survey has been modified to include this requirement.

### **Program 3: Benefits and Support Services**

Manager(s): Karla Sumpter

Supervisor(s): Brender L. Gregory, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeds Expectations*

DCHR began FY07 with new measures. Targets for these measures were developed during FY07 or will be based on FY07 data. Terminations are processed as received by agencies. All agencies may not complete necessary paperwork for separation within 45 days of employee separation however, the Benefits office completes paperwork within 45 days of receipt.

Measure 3.1: Percent of health benefit terminations completed within 45 days of separation

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	85	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	66.6	96.1	100	-

Measure 3.2: Sick leave utilization rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: This measure is not provided by any DCHR personnel system and is available through Office of Pay and Retirement Services (OPRS).

**Program 4: Compensation***Supervisor(s):* Brender L. Gregory, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

DCHR began FY07 with new measures. Targets for these measures were developed during FY07 or will be based on FY07 data.

Measure 4.1: PeopleSoft HRIS/Payroll System Error Rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: The PeopleSoft HRIS/Payroll System did not go live until Fiscal Year 08. This module is used by the Office of Pay and Retirement Services (OPRS). Therefore, the system error rate would be reported by OPRS. This measure is not reflective of responsibilities of DCHR and should be deleted.

**Program 5: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Anh-Tuan Truong*Supervisor(s):* Brender Gregory, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.2: Cost of Risk

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.3: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	26	20.1	-	-

Measure 5.4: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	N/A
Actual	84.62	N/A	46.2	33	-

## Office of Financial Management (AS0)

### Program 1: Financial Management

Supervisor(s): Mohamed A. Mohamed, Interim Associate Chief Financial Officer

### Program Result: No Rating

The Office of Financial Management (AS0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of agencies compliant with the Anti-Deficiency Act	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2006.					
Measure 1.2:	Percentage of invoices paid within the timeframe of the Quick Payment Act	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2007. FY 2006 data is baseline (11/06).					
Measure 1.3:	Percentage of Federal Grant draw downs performed in accordance with the CMIA	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2007. FY 2006 data is baseline (11/06).					
Measure 1.4:	Percent of Intra-District billings processed on schedule	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	95	95	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
	Note: Measure name changed from "Percent of Intra-District payments processed" at agency request (2/06).					
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of Interim and Closing packages submitted on time	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	12	98	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-
	Note: Measure modified from "Number of monthly closings completed" and FY 2007 target increased from 12 to 98 percent at agency request (2/06).					
Measure 1.6:	Percent of spending plans and FRPs submitted on time	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2007 (2/06).					
Measure 1.7:	Average number of days to process requisitions and purchase orders	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
	Actual	N/A	N/A	0.004	-	-

**Program 2: Resource Management***Manager(s):* Dennis Gill, Director of Resource Management*Supervisor(s):* Mohamed A. Mohamed, Interim Associate Chief Financial Officer**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Office of Financial Management (AS0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1: Re-engineer billing process and establish internal forecasting capability for 4 areas of fixed cost

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4
Actual	N/A	N/A	4	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. FY 2006 is the baseline year (11/06).

Measure 2.2: Conduct cellular phone and landline inventory audits

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	1	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. FY 2006 is the baseline year (11/06).

Measure 2.3: Number of financial audits for Utility Accounts

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	3	3	3
Actual	N/A	N/A	4	-	-

**Program 3: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Natalie Mayers, Chief Management Officer*Supervisor(s):* Mohamed A. Mohamed, Interim Associate Chief Financial Officer**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Office of Financial Management (AS0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	-	-

Measure 3.4:	Number of client-based financial management workshops	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	4
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure FY 2007.					
Measure 3.5:	Number of customer satisfaction surveys	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure FY 2007.					
Measure 3.6:	Percent of employees trained	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure FY 2007.					

## Office of Contracting and Procurement (PO0)

### Program 1: Contracting

**Manager(s):** Esther Scarborough, Assistant Director for the Operations Division and Infrastructure

**Supervisor(s):** David Gragan, Chief Procurement Officer

### Program Result: Met Expectations

Overall, OCP met expectations in the Contracting Program.

Measure 1.1: Small purchase average cycle time in days, OCP only

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	7.5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	7.98	-

Note: For FY 2007 replaces previous "Measure 1.1: Small purchase cycle time in days." Tracking the average time for all agencies' small purchases introduced factors beyond OCP's control.

Measure 1.2: Percent of Invitation for Bids (IFBs) under \$1 million awarded within 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	70	70	70	70
Actual	55	40.63	37.5	53.33	-

Note: The FY 2005-2006 targets were decreased from 90 to 70 per agency request (1/10/05). The FY 2007 target is decreased from 75 to 70 per agency request (2/13/06).

Measure 1.3: Percent of Request for Proposals (RFPs) under \$1 million awarded within 120 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	70	70	75	75
Actual	67	72.73	84.6	92.86	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of contract awards over \$100,000 that contain LSDBE subcontracting plans

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	10	15	20
Actual	N/A	N/A	40	82.35	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 (3/8/05).

Measure 1.5: Percent of eligible contracts \$100,000 and over containing LSDBE subcontracting plans monitored for compliance

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 (3/8/05). The KRM name is changed from "Percent of contracts containing LSDBE subcontracting plans monitored according to established standards" per agency request (2/13/06).

Measure 1.6: Percent of customer agencies with which OCP establishes Service Level Agreements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	97	98
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	93.33	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007 (2/13/06).

**Program 2: Public Accountability***Manager(s):* Janis Bolt, Communications Officer*Supervisor(s):* David Gragan, Chief Procurement Officer**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

OCP met expectations for the Public Accountability Program. Measure 2.1: Percent of OCP customer agency personnel rating OCP services as satisfactory or better, fell short of its target. This is the program's single KRM and qualifies for the rating of Met Expectations.

Measure 2.1: Percent of OCP customer agency personnel rating OCP services as satisfactory or better

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	72.4	83.33	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006

**Program 3: Personal Property***Manager(s):* Wilber Giles, Manager, PPD, Interim Chief of Staff*Supervisor(s):* David Gragan, Chief Procurement Officer**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

OPM surpassed the targets for two of the three measures within the Personal Property Program. Overall, it exceeded expectations.

Measure 3.1: Percent of District agency property disposal actions (PDA) completed within 5 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	40	85	90	95	95
Actual	88	58.47	92.1	92	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of District agencies and not-for-profits requests for excess/surplus property transfer orders completed within two business days of request

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	70	80	80	85
Actual	93	86.73	97.8	99.15	-

Note: FY 2007 target is reduced from 85% to 80% per agency request (2/13/06).

Measure 3.3: Average monthly revenue from proceeds of personal property sales

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	50000	45000	45000
Actual	N/A	N/A	27556	48514	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 (3/8/05). FY 2007 target is reduced from 60,000 to 45,000 per agency request (2/13/06).

**Program 4: Agency Management***Supervisor(s):* David Gragan, Chief Procurement Officer**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	52	75	-	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	85.71	33	63.6	54.5	-

## ***Office of the Chief Technology Officer (TOO)***

### **Program 1: Enterprise Systems Program**

*Manager(s):* Thomas T. Jones, Deputy CTO

*Supervisor(s):* Vivek Kundra, Chief Technology Officer

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 1.0: Percent of mission-critical agency purchases in compliance with published District IT hardware/software standards

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: This measure is added per agency request (02/09/06).

Measure 1.1: Percent of total UCC project budget expended

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	85	100	N/A
Actual	N/A	52	84.27	78.18	-

Note: Replaces "Percent of construction completed on Unified Communications Center (UCC)". Project is scheduled for completion in FY 2007 so no FY 2008 target is provided. (3/06)

Measure 1.2: Number of GIS Geospatial Database Layers Updated

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	36	36
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: This measure is added per agency request (02/09/06).

### **Program 2: Technical Services Program**

*Manager(s):* Thomas T. Jones, Deputy CTO

*Supervisor(s):* Vivek Kundra, Chief Technology Officer

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 2.1: Number of non-infrastructure capital IT projects using BPR services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

### **Program 3: Data Center Operations and Maintenance**

*Manager(s):* Glenn Minter

*Supervisor(s):* Christopher Willey, Deputy CTO

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The Office of the Chief Technology Officer fell a little short of the target for the one Key Result Measure in the Data Center Operations and Maintenance Program. An agency is rated met expectations when an actual result falls within 90-99% of a projected target.

Measure 3.0:	Percent of District-wide servers identified for consolidation complete					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	35
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.1:	Percent of application response times that fall within established standards					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	50	98	98	98	98
	Actual	98	97.17	96.75	96.56	-

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Maurice Henderson, Chief of Staff

*Supervisor(s):* Vivek Kundra, Chief Technology Officer

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	55.6	33	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	91.67	80	75	-	-

## Office of Property Management (AM0)

### Program 1: Asset Management

**Manager(s):** Tanya Washington, Program Analyst; Anthony Jimenez, Energy Management Specialist; Ajay Kapoor, Supervisory General Engineer; Kathleen Linebaugh, Asset Manager

**Supervisor(s):** Leah Treat, Chief of Staff; Rick Gersten, Deputy Director, Portfolio Management; Gerick Smith, Deputy Director, Construction Division

### Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

DC OPM exceeded expectations for the six targets within the Asset Management Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of customers satisfied with OPM managed facilities

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	85	85	85
Actual	82.5	69.23	61.54	75	-

Note: FY 2006 target has been decreased from 90 to 85 at agency request (2/17/05). FY 2007 and 2008 targets are decreased from 90 to 85 at agency request (2/27/06).

Measure 1.2: Percent of utility and fuel invoices certified for payment or disputed within 25 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	100	100	95	95
Actual	97.51	98.43	99.22	99.56	-

Measure 1.3: Percent change in the difference between the original delivery schedule and the actual delivery schedule for capital construction projects

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	25	10	10	10
Actual	N/A	33	11.86	7.07	-

Note: KRM wordings revised from "Percent change in the difference between the original construction schedule and actual delivery". The goal is to keep the Actuals less than the Targets (1/9/07).

Measure 1.4: Percent of capital construction projects given a notice to proceed within 90-days of the contract award date

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	95	95	100
Actual	N/A	90.91	100	100	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of dollar value of change orders compared to total construction costs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	15	15	15	10
Actual	N/A	7.29	2.52	1.43	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of total rent receivables collected

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	95
Actual	98.77	96.67	95.12	111.24	-

**Program 2: Facility Operations**

*Manager(s):* Albert Venson, Facility Service Manager; Nejat Rasson, Facility Operations and Maintenance Administrator; George Dunmore, Postal Services; Alicia Cowans, Parking Coordinator

*Supervisor(s):* Spencer Davis, Deputy Director, Facilities Division

**Program Result: Met Expectations**

OPM exceeded one target and did not meet two targets for the three Key Result Measures in the Facility Operations Program. Overall, the agency met expectations in this program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of mail processed within 24 hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	95	95	95	100
Actual	90.81	98.32	99.14	99.7	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of District monthly parking fees compared to average monthly parking fees at private/federal garages				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	50	75	75	30
Actual	N/A	20.05	21.94	34.78	-
Note: FY 2008 target is reduced from 75%, at agency request (2/27/07). Agency comment: Parking fees are being raised to move closer to commercial garage fees. The target, in theory, therefore, would be going up.					

Measure 2.3:	Percent of emergency repair requests responded to within 24 hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	90	90	90	90
Actual	94.94	90.44	73.71	84.21	-
Note: Measure revised from "Percent of emergency repairs resolved within 24 hrs" (3/10/06).					

**Program 3: Protective Services**

*Manager(s):* Arnold Bracy, Chief, Protective Services

*Supervisor(s):* Spencer Davis, Deputy Director, Facilities Division

**Program Result: Exceeded Expectations**

Overall, OPM exceeded expectations in the Protective Services Program.

Measure 3.1: period	Percentage of guards in compliance with licensing standards within a given seven day				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	99.97	99.99	99.95	-

Measure 3.2:	Percentage of alarms responded to within 20 minutes during non-government hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	93.18	100	-

**Program 4: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Leah Treat, Chief of Staff*Supervisor(s):* Robin-Eve Jasper, Interim-Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	41	38	-	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	75	64	72.7	-

## ***Contract Appeals Board (AF0)***

### **Program 1: Adjudication**

*Manager(s):* Jonathan Zischkau, Chief Administrative Judge

*Supervisor(s):* Jonathan Zischkau, Chief Administrative Judge

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

The targets for three out of five of the Adjudication Program's Key Result Measures were met or surpassed.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of protests resolved within 60 business days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	92	87.5	-

Measure 1.2:	Percentage of appeals cases decided within 4 months of the cases being ready for decision					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	25	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	25	25.71	-
	Note: Per agency request, the measure name is revised from "Percentage of appeals on the docket resolved" and the targets for FY 2007, 2008 and 2009 are increased from 25% (3/5/07).					

Measure 1.3:	Percentage of decisions submitted for publication					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Measure 1.4:	Percentage of new cases using electronic filing system					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Measure 1.5:	Percentage of closed cases electronically archived					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	20	20	20
	Actual	N/A	N/A	89.36	92.86	-

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Jonathan Zischkau, Chief Administrative Judge

*Supervisor(s):* Jonathan Zischkau, Chief Administrative Judge

### **Goal Result: No Rating**

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to expenditure to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	7	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	80	60	-

## Office of Campaign Finance (CJ0)

### Program 1: Oversight Support Services

Supervisor(s): Cecily E. Collier-Montgomery, Director

### Program Result: Met Expectations

The Office of Campaign Finance met expectations for its Oversight Support Services Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of respondents that use the electronic filing system

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	34.32	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of campaign finance forms, brochures, regulations, calendars, interpretive opinions, and summary reports of filings that are available on the office's Internet home page

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.44	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of written requests concerning the application of the DC Campaign Finance Act to a specific or general activity or transaction that receive an interpretation opinion within the targeted timeframe of thirty days upon receipt of request

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	87.50	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of all financial disclosure records filed for compliance with the requirements of the DC Campaign Finance Act and Standard Operating Procedures reviewed, evaluated and analyzed before the next filing deadline

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of field audits completed on selected committees based on desk audit findings, investigations and special requests

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of statistical reports and summaries of desk reviews, evaluations, analysis, and field audits conducted on various filing entities disseminated within targeted timeframes (times vary)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Measure 1.7:	Percent of all financial reports, organizations and candidate registration statements, lobbyist reports, financial disclosure statements and other documents processed and maintained in an accurate and current record to ensure timely public availability	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Measure 1.8:	Percent of listings of financial and other disclosure information required for submission by May 15 and publication by June 15 to the DC Register by the DC Office of Documents developed and compiled with statutory timeframes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Measure 1.9:	Percent of District government agency heads that help produce an accurate and currently filing of persons required to file the Financial Disclosure Statements	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	16.58	-
Measure 1.10:	Percent of complaints of alleged violations of the DC Campaign Finance Act that are investigated, addressed in hearings, and resolved within the statutory timeframe of ninety days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Measure 1.11:	Percent of regulations amended annually (when needed) and new rules drafted to be consistent with changes in legislation and administrative procedures	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Cecily E. Collier-Montgomery, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	54.5	-

## ***Public Employee Relations Board (CG0)***

### **Program 1: Adjudication**

*Supervisor(s):* Julio A. Castillo, Executive Director

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

Out of four KRMs applicable for FY 2007, the Public Employee Relations Board (CG0) has exceeded the target of one KRM, met the target of one KRM and fell below the target of two KRMs. Overall, the agency met expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of cases decided within 120 days of submission to the Board	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	80	80	80
	Actual	N/A	N/A	80	90	-
Measure 1.2:	Percentage of decisions transmitted to the D.C. Registrar for publication within 60 days of issuance	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	80	80	-
Measure 1.3:	Percentage of cases appealed to courts in which the Public Employee Relations Board prevailed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	75
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	67	-
Measure 1.4:	Percentage of compensation impasse resolution cases that meet statutory time targets (e.g. mediation within 30 days, arbitration within 45 days after the panel has been established)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of protests resolved within 60 business days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.6:	Percentage of appeals on the docket resolved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	25
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.7:	Percentage of decisions submitted for publication	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 1.8:	Percentage of new cases using electronic filing systems					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Julio A. Castillo, Executive Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	75	50	-

## ***Office of Employee Appeals (CH0)***

### **Program 1: Adjudication**

*Supervisor(s):* Warren M. Cruise, Esq., Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Number of initial decisions issued	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	200	200	200
	Actual	N/A	N/A	216	182	-

Measure 1.2:	Number of Opinions and Orders (on petitions for review) issued	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	35	35	35
	Actual	N/A	N/A	37	35	-

Measure 1.3:	Number of mediations conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	40	25	25
	Actual	N/A	N/A	23	25	-
Note: The FY 2007 and 2008 targets are reduced from 40, per agency request (2/28/07).						

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Warren M. Cruise, Esq., Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	75	66.7	-

## Office of the Attorney General (CB0)

### Program 1: Public Safety Program

Manager(s): David Rubenstein, Deputy Attorney General

Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

### Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

OAG surpassed all of the targets for the Public Safety Program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of appropriately presented adult cases successfully resolved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	75
Actual	N/A	73.76	74.03	83.5	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without a target as a baseline (3/10/06). Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of appropriately presented adult criminal cases resolved favorably for the District of Columbia" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.2:	Percent of appropriately presented juveniles receiving rehabilitation services as a result of OAG action				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	88	92.66	91.34	87.62	-
Measure 1.3:	Amount of recovery from Consumer Trade and Protection efforts				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	2	N/A	2
Actual	N/A	267.56	-66.02	1.9M	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent increase in recovery from Consumer and Trade Protection efforts" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.4:	Amount of recovery from Civil Enforcement efforts				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	2	N/A	2
Actual	N/A	-24.42	11.33	6.3M	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent increase in recovery from Civil Enforcement efforts" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of participation in Neighborhood Services Core Team meetings				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	91.6	92.59	-
Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 actual data to be collected as a baseline.					

**Program 2: Civil Litigation***Manager(s):* George Valentine, Deputy Attorney General, Civil Litigation Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

OAG surpassed the target for one of the measures while the other target was not met. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Civil Litigation program.

Measure 2.1: Percent change in closed civil litigation cases.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
Actual	N/A	N/A	13.72	2.5	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006 (12/28/06). Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent change in closed Civil Litigation cases" (2/15/07).

Measure 2.2: Percent change in dollars spent on torts litigation.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2
Actual	-25	3.85	-15.76	127.45	-

**Program 3: Commercial Transactions***Manager(s):* Bruce Brennan, Acting Deputy Attorney General, Commercial Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Attorney General surpassed the single target for this performance measure. The agency completed 87.29% of the transactional agreements and documents within agreed-upon timeframes, significantly exceeding its 80% target.

Measure 3.1: Percent of the required written advice completed within agreed upon time frames

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	80	80	80
Actual	88	77.87	86.37	87.29	-

Note: FY 2006 target decreased from 90 to 80 (2/21/05). KRM 2.1 through FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of the transactional agreements and documents completed within-agreed upon time frames" (2/15/07).

**Program 4: Legal Counsel***Manager(s):* Wayne Witkowski, Deputy Attorney General, Legal Counsel Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Attorney General significantly exceeded the single target for the performance measure for the Legal Counsel Program. The agency completed 99.15% of requests for legal review and advice within agreed-upon timeframes thereby significantly exceeding the expectations of 90%.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the required written advice completed within agreed upon time frames				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	95	96.87	97.97	99.15	-
Note: KRM 3.1 through FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of the requests for legal advice completed within agreed-upon time frames" (2/15/07).					

**Program 5: Appellate Program**  
**Manager(s):** Todd Kim, Solicitor General  
**Supervisor(s):** Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded one target and did not meet expectations for the other target of the two performance measures for this goal. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Appellate Program.

Measure 5.1:	Percent change in affirmative appeals prosecuted				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
Actual	N/A	N/A	0	-21.43	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording "taken" is replaced by "prosecuted" (2/15/07).					

Measure 5.2:	Percent of all Defensive Appeals cases favorably resolved for the District of Columbia				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	89.24	95.06	91.19	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without target for baseline. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of defensive appeals favorably resolved" (2/15/07).					

**Program 6: Family Services**  
**Manager(s):** Sarah Gold, Acting Deputy Attorney General  
**Supervisor(s):** Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded the sole target of the one performance measures for the Family Services Program.

Measure 6.1:	Percent of Family Services cases resolved favorably to DC				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	80	90
Actual	N/A	97.07	96.33	97.15	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without target as baseline. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of family services cases presented and resolved favorably" (2/15/07).					

**Program 7: Child Support Enforcement**  
**Manager(s):** Benidia Rice, Deputy Attorney General, Child Support Services Division  
**Supervisor(s):** Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded one target and did not meet expectations for the other target of the two performance measures for this goal. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Child Support Enforcement Program.

Measure 7.1:	Percent change in support orders established					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Actual	14	21.71	12.97	7.12	-
Measure 7.2:	Percent increase of collections					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Actual	16	9.02	-	0.93	-

**Program 8: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Eugene Adams, Chief Deputy Attorney General; Pamela Satterfield, Chief of Staff

*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 8.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 8.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 8.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	48	71.43	-	-
Measure 8.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	78.57	61.5	71.43	75	-

## ***Office of the Inspector General (AD0)***

### **Program 1: Accountability, Control and Compliance**

**Manager(s):** Cheryl Johnson, Deputy AIG for Audits; Alfred Miller, Deputy AIG for Investigations; Edward Farley, Deputy AIG for Inspections and Evaluations (I&E); and Jacqueline Schesnol, Deputy Director, Medicaid Fraud Control Unit (MFCU)

**Supervisor(s):** William J. DiVello, AIG for Audits; Leonard Odom, AIG for Investigations; Alvin Wright, Jr., AIG for I&E; and Susan Bieber Kennedy, Director, MFCU

### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 1.1: Percent of District agencies provided with audit coverage/presence

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	30	30	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	42	35	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of OIG audit recommendations that have been implemented by District agencies

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Measure 1.3: Percentage of potential monetary benefits identified by OIG audits

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	95	95	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	200	276	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of all complaints evaluated within 3 days of receipt in the Investigations Division

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	87	97	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of preliminary investigations completed within one month of assignment to investigator in Investigations Division

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	50	86	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of administrative investigations pending in the Investigations Division at the beginning of the fiscal year that are closed by the end of the fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	60	65	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	50	100	-

Measure 1.7: Percent of Hotline calls cleared that are received in the Investigations Division

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	85	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	98	97	-

Measure 1.8:	Percent of referral letters prepared within one week of complaint assignment to Investigations Division referral program				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	85	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	95	99	-
Measure 1.9:	Percent of inspections/evaluations completed by I&E Division.				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-
Measure 1.10:	Percent of re-inspections/evaluations completed by I&E Division.				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	50	100	-
Measure 1.11:	Percent of completed planned agency inspections/evaluations, re-inspections/evaluations and special reports assigned during the fiscal year.				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.12:	Percent of abuse/neglect complaints evaluated by MFCU (Medicaid Fraud Control Unit) within 1 business day of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	81	94	-
Measure 1.13	Percent of fraud complaints evaluated by MFCU within 21 days of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	98	98	-
	Note: Time decreased from 30 days to 21 days at agency request. (2/2007)				
Measure 1.14:	Percent of complaints of funds/property misappropriation evaluated by MFCU within 5 days of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	80	93	-
Measure 1.15:	Percent of relevant entities provided training/in-service education by MFCU staff				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	60	60	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	110	100	-
	Note: This percentage is based on 10 relevant entities.				

Measure 1.16: Percent of criminal/civil resolutions obtained (plea, settlement, or verdict) in MFCU cases

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	60	60	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	130	170	-

Note: This measure is based on 10 resolutions in a fiscal year.

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Roger Burke, Chief of Staff

*Supervisor(s):* Charles Willoughby, Inspector General

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	20.9	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	73.3	100	-

## ***Office of the Chief Financial Officer (AT0)***

### **Program 1: Financial Operations and Systems**

*Manager(s):* Anthony F. Pompa, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Financial Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer met both targets for the two performance measures for this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of paychecks accurately prepared and distributed within payroll schedule					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	99	99	99	99	99
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of monthly closing completed within 10 days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-

### **Program 2: Budget Development and Execution**

*Manager(s):* Gordon McDonald, Interim Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Budget and Planning

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the agency exceeds expectation.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of agencies preparing performance-based budgets for the following year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	71	71	100	100	100
	Actual	80	80	100	83.15	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of agencies that reprogram more than 10% of budget					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	8	5	3	3	3
	Actual	14.3	2.86	-	12.5	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of agencies with spending pressures that are resolved by sources external to the agency					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	4	4	4
	Actual	54.6	4	-	100	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of awarded grant funds lost due to lapse of grant					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	1	1	1	0.75	0.75
	Actual	0.6	0.76	-	1.01	-

**Program 3: Revenue Analysis***Manager(s):* Robert Ebel, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Revenue Analysis*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 3.1:	Percent variation between the original binding revenue estimate as compared to actual revenue and the CBO estimate of federal revenue and actual federal revenue				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	5.19	6.99	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of ad hoc documents reviewed by ORA that do not contain factual errors				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	99.5	99.1	99.63	100	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of applications for tax increment financing that are reviewed and processed within 120 days of receipt in ORA				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

**Program 4: Tax Administration***Manager(s):* Stephen Cordi, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Tax and Revenue*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in the Tax Administration program.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of returns filed electronically				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	25	30	35	35	40
Actual	41	32.2	33.95	43.28	-

Note: This measure was previously written as "Percent of customers satisfied with information provided." There is no reliable survey tool to determine customer satisfaction, therefore the agency has redefined the measure.

Measure 4.2:	Percent of documents filed electronically				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	2.4	3	3.5	5	6
Actual	1.9	3.19	3.9	7.37	-

Note: This measure was previously written as "Percent of recorded documents with complete and accurate information." The metric was not operationally useful, thus the agency changed it to "Percentage of documents (deed recordation, transfer, and UCC filings) filed electronically."

Measure 4.3:	Ratio of assessment changes to total value of assessments appealed				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5.5	6.5	6	6	6
Actual	6.6	6.13	5.11	7.03	-

Note: Measure originally worded as "Percent of assessments upheld on appeal." The revised measure better captures the accuracy rate of assessments, by calculating any changes made by BRPAA or the Superior Court as a percentage of the original assessment.

Measure 4.4:	Delinquent account collections (in million dollars)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	105	83.8	87.9	92.3
Actual	84.3	79.98	93	127	-

Note: The agency reduced the FY 2006 target from \$105 million to \$83.8 million . (3/11/06)

Measure 4.5:	Percent of refunds issued within 14 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	86.9	100	87.4	84.75	-

**Program 5: Information Technology**

*Manager(s):* Mike Teller, Chief Information Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer exceeded both targets of the two performance measures in the Information Technology Program. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 5.1:	Percent of payroll system project milestones completed on time and within budget				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	90	90	90	90
Actual	96	91.21	93.56	93.36	-

Measure 5.2:	Percent of the District's accounting, budget, payroll, and tax systems available				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	95	95	95	95
Actual	92	95.96	95.64	95.28	-

**Program 6: Finance and Treasury**

*Manager(s):* Lasana Mack, Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Overall, the agency met expectations for this program.

Measure 6.1:	Debt service to expenditures ratio				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	13	13	13	N/A	13
Actual	8.5	9.1	8	-	-

Measure 6.2:	Percentage of banking service contracts whose costs are lower than Phoenix Hecht index	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	7.6	-	-

Measure 6.3:	Percent of checks and earning statements meeting payment schedule	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
	Actual	N/A	21	4	-	-

Measure 6.4:	Percentage of unclaimed property returned to owners	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
	Actual	N/A	N/A	25	-	-
	Note: Per agency request, this measure will replace the Key Result Measure (KRM) 6.4: "Percent of unclaimed property returned to owners", effective FY 2008 (3/19/2007).					

**Program 7: Integrity and Oversight**

*Manager(s):* Mohamad Yuseff, Interim Executive Director, Integrity and Oversight

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Overall, the agency met expectations for this program.

Measure 7.1:	Percent of audit recommendations that are fully or partially implemented or resolved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	92.7	95.48	96.41	80	-

Measure 7.2:	Percent of integrity probes conducted.	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	88	100
	Actual	100	100	100	77.78	-

Measure 7.3:	Percent of investigation reports accepted.	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	4	4	4	95	4
	Actual	0	0	-	100	0

**Program 8: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Angell Jacobs, Director of Operations; Paul Lundquist, Executive Director, Office of Mgmt & Administration

*Supervisor(s):* Natwar M. Gandhi, Chief Financial Officer

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 8.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	66.67	58.33	-	-

Measure 8.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	81	78.3	72	76.9	-

**Program 9: Agency Financial Operations**

**Manager(s):** Cyril Byron, ACFO, Econ. Develop. And Regulation Cluster; Mohamed Mohamed, Acting ACFO, Gov. Operations Cluster; George Dines, Acting ACFO, Gov. Services Cluster; Deloras Shepherd, ACFO, Human Support Services Cluster; Angelique Hayes, ACFO, Public Safety and Justice Cluster

**Supervisor(s):** Angell Jacobs, Director of Operations

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

OCFO significantly exceeded targets for all five measures for the Agency Financial Operations Program.

Measure 9.1:	Percent of spending plans and RFPs submitted					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
	Actual	N/A	71.14	98.71	99.3	-

Measure 9.2:	Percent of reprogramming processed					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
	Actual	N/A	97.19	89.63	97	-

Measure 9.3:	Percent of interim and annual closing packages submitted on-time					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
	Actual	N/A	95.82	94.41	95.43	-

Measure 9.4:	Percent of audit recommendations implemented					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	60	59	59	59
	Actual	N/A	74.29	80.77	86.67	-

Measure 9.5:	Percent of OCFO cluster direct service staff provided intermediate level or better training experiences in technology, financial analysis, writing skills or project management training					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	30	30	30	30
	Actual	N/A	54.4	42.94	53.12	-





**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter B: Economic Development and  
Regulation**

**March 2008**

---

## Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development (EB0)

### Program 1: Deputy Mayor For Planning and Economic Development

**Manager(s):** David Jannarone, Director of Development , Valerie Santos-Young, Chief Operating Officer, and Eric Scott, Deputy Director of Operations

**Supervisor(s):** Neil Albert, Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development

### Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

Overall, the agency exceeded expectations for this program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of cluster agency key result measure targets achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	70	70	70	70
Actual	92.6	78.7	84	N/A	-

Note: At the time this report was submitted, not all agencies in the DMPED cluster had fully reported data.

Measure 1.2: Rate of private funds leveraged with public funds through Economic Development Finance projects

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	200.1	225	225	225	1500
Actual	224.1	5138.59	236.91	193	-

Note: The target and actual was represented earlier as the ratio of private dollars to public dollars (e.g., \$225 private:\$1 public). The ratio is changed to a percentage (e.g., 225:1 = 225% for the above example).

Measure 1.3: Rate of private funds leveraged with public funds through reSTORE DC projects

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3.7	42.85	42.85	42.85	100
Actual	3.7	54.43	147.7	339.2	-

Note: The target and actual was represented earlier as the ratio of private dollars to public dollars (e.g., \$3 private:\$7 public). The ratio is changed to a percentage (e.g., 3:7 = 42.85% for the above example).

Measure 1.4: Percent increase in District businesses surveyed regarding retention/expansion plans and District business climate factors

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	300	67	10	10	15
Actual	380	-87.37	83.33	57.95	-

Note: Measure was modified from a number to a percent change (5/04). FY 2005 and FY2006 targets reflect percent change. FY 2006 decreased from 67 to 10 per agency request (2/24/05).

Measure 1.5: Percent of vacant and abandoned housing units demolished

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	63.64	-

Note: Measure added during the FY 2005 budget development cycle. DCRA demolished 15 units which was 100% of the demand in FY 2006. For FY 2007, the goal is to demolish 50 units (3/12/07).

Measure 1.6: Percent of vacant and abandoned housing units brought into compliance with the housing code

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	95	95	95
Actual	N/A	100	100	734.86	-

Measure 1.7: Percent of affordable housing units funded

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	107.23	139	102.5	-

Note: Measure added in FY 2005 is a combination of "Percent of multi-family rehab funding" and "Targeted new housing units funded". The target for FY 2007-2008 is the percentage of 2000 units.

Measure 1.8: Percent of unemployed adult customers placed in full-time unsubsidized employment

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	65	70	70	70	70
Actual	71.57	71.32	77.43	79.24	-

Note: New measure added 5/04 during the FY 2005 budget development cycle.

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* David Jannarone, Director of Development , Valerie Santos-Young, Chief Operating Officer, and Eric Scott, Deputy Director of Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Neil Albert, Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	41	21	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	86	77.8	100	75	-

## ***Office of Planning (BD0)***

### **Program 1: Zoning Review and Historic Preservation**

*Manager(s):* Joel Lawson, David Maloney

*Supervisor(s):* Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Planning significantly exceeded expectations for the two KRM's in its Zoning Review and Historic Preservation Program. Measure 1.1: Percent of OP reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions, surpassed its target of 85% with results of 92.4% and Measure 1.2: Percent of historic preservation law violations brought into compliance, achieved results of 87.12%, far above the target of 50%.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of OP reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	85	85	85	85
	Actual	97.5	93.93	93.8	92.4	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of historic preservation law violations brought into compliance					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	6	N/A	50	50	50
	Actual	10	80.57	80.9	87.12	-

### **Program 2: Neighborhood Planning**

*Manager(s):* Rosalynn Hughey

*Supervisor(s):* Charles Graves, Deputy Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OP significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing its single target in the Neighborhood Planning Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of identified cluster stakeholders who participated in neighborhood planning processes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	50	50	50	50	50
	Actual	95	100	0	87.5	-

Note: This measure tracks stakeholder participation in completed neighborhood plans; that is, which stakeholders, identified at the beginning of the planning process, did in fact participate in the creation of the plan. No plans were fully completed in FY 2006, and therefore there are no Actuals to report for this measure.

### **Program 3: Revitalization Planning**

*Manager(s):* Patricia Zingsheim

*Supervisor(s):* Charles Graves, Deputy Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OP significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing its target for the single measure of the Revitalization Planning Program.

Measure 3.1: Percent of strategic framework plan implementation items completed by the end of the fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	50	80	66.67	60
Actual	66	83.33	83.3	83.33	-

Note: FY 2006 target increased from 50 to 80 at agency request (2/17/05). FY 2007 target decreased from 80 to 66.67 at agency request (3/10/06).

**Program 4: Long-Range Planning**

*Manager(s):* Charlie Richman, Barry Miller

*Supervisor(s):* Charles Graves, Deputy Director

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Targets for both of this Program's KRMs were comfortably surpassed, resulting in Long-Range Planning significantly exceeding expectations.

Measure 4.1: Percent of customers who report they have the information they need to fulfill their role in planning the city

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	70	80	75	75
Actual	97.7	98.52	95.1	96.94	-

Note: FY 2006 target increased from 70 to 80 per agency request (2/17/05). FY 2007 target decreased from 80 to 75 per agency request (2/8/06).

Measure 4.2: Percent of non-life safety, non-OCTO CIP project requests reviewed by the Office of Planning as part of the Budget Review Team activities

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	75	75	75	75
Actual	100	78.95	100	-	-

Measure 4.3: Percent of stakeholders who have the information to undertake demographic and socio-economic analysis

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	75	75
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	85.59	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

**Program 5: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Harriet Tregoning, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	59.3	62.5	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	83.33	85.7	85.7	-

## ***Department of Small and Local Business Development (EN0)***

### **Program 1: Business Development**

**Manager(s):** Harold Pettigrew, Chief of Staff

**Supervisor(s):** Erik Moses, Director

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

The Department of Small and Local Business Development met expectations for the Business Development Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of applications processed within 45 days for forwarding to the SLBOC Commission

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	60	80	80	85
Actual	N/A	65.46	64.37	51.46	-

Note: FY 2006-2007 targets decreased from 100 to 80 percent at agency request (2/10/2006).

Measure 1.2: Percent of CBE certification applicants notified within 5 days of SLBOC approval

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	112.26	-	100	-

Note: Per agency request, the measure is revised from "Percent of certificates issued within 15 days of Commission approval" (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.3: Percent of noncompliant agencies scheduled for consultation within 30 days after quarterly reporting

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	70	75	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Note: Replaces "Percent of noncompliant agencies scheduled for a meeting within 15 days after quarterly reporting".

Measure 1.4: Percent of AAPs received that will be processed within 10 business days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	80	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.5: Hyperlink DSLBD's website to federal and local government procurement websites

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007 (2/10/2006).

Measure 1.6: Provide technical assistance to a minimum of 20 CBE firms

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007 (2/20/2006). The measure wording is revised from "Support LSDBD resource center (in Department)", per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.7: Schedule a minimum of ten (10) CBE application information/training sessions for local businesses

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007 (2/10/2006). Per agency request, the measure wording is changed from "Schedule a minimum of five training sessions supporting small businesses" (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.8: Percent of CBE certification applicants notified via certified mail within 30 days of SLBOC denial

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.9: Percent of completed applications fully processed and notified within 90 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.10: Establish a minimum of 3 industry advisory groups

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.11: Establish a minimum of 3 focus group meetings between CBE firms and various financing agents

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.12: Schedule a minimum of 2 major networking events

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.13: Conduct a minimum of 4 Agency training sessions on CBE law provisions

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).

Measure 1.14:	Conduct quarterly staff training sessions					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2008 (3/1/2007).					

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Harold Pettigrew, Chief of Staff

*Supervisor(s):* Erik Moses, Director

**Goal Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	46.2	29	-	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	80	50	57.1	-

## ***Office of Motion Pictures and Television Development (TK0)***

### **Program 1: Motion Picture and Television**

*Supervisor(s):* Crystal Palmer, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall the agency exceeded expectations for this program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of all forms of contact (trade shows, presentations, direct mail campaign, e-photo delivery, etc.) that result in an actual project

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	40	45	50	52
Actual	N/A	N/A	47	50	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of filmmakers that rank the overall film experience in DC as satisfactory or most satisfactory

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	93	93	93
Actual	N/A	N/A	99	97.13	-

Measure 1.3: Percent change in registered homes and businesses on the Celluloid City Directory

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	5	223	-

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Crystal Palmer, Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	30.8	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	75	66.7	-

## Office of Zoning (BJ0)

### Program 1: Zoning Services

**Manager(s):** Clifford Moy, Secretary to the BZA; Sharon Schellin, Secretary to the ZC; Leigh Johnson, Compliance Review Program Manager; Nyambi A. Nyambi, Chief Technology Officer; Richard S. Nero, Jr., Deputy Director of Operations

**Supervisor(s):** Jerrily R. Kress, Director

### Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The DC Office of Zoning (DCOZ) significantly exceeded all targets for the six Key Result Measures in the Zoning Services Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of BZA application cases heard within 120 days after acceptance of application

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	80	80	80
Actual	N/A	92.75	95.73	94.19	-

Note: The timetable to hear cases has been increased from 80 days to 120 days due to a significant increase in the number of cases filed (3/11/06).

Measure 1.2: Percent of ZC contested cases heard within 120 days after supplemental filing

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	80	80	80
Actual	N/A	90.91	66.67	92.31	-

Note: Measure wording changed at request of agency (5/04). At agency request "90 days" is changed to "120 days" in the Measure name (2/26/07).

Measure 1.3: Percent of compliance issues that are resolved including referral to DCRA

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	88.89	100	100	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of customers who report that they were satisfied with service (information they require on the OZ website, at seminars or in the electronic reading room)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	94.29	96.63	90.39	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of zoning certifications provided within 30 calendar days from receipt of full application

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	94.85	83.19	98.96	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of case files certified for court records within statutory established timeframes

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	83	83	83	83
Actual	N/A	87.5	100	87.5	-

Note: FY 2006 target decreased from 90 to 83 per agency request (2/17/05).

**Program 2: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Jerrily R. Kress, Director*Supervisor(s):* Jerrily R. Kress, Director**Goal Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	72	79.17	-	-

Measure 2.3: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	100	71.43	100	-

## ***Department of Housing and Community Development (DB0)***

### **Program 1: Homeownership and Home Rehabilitation Assistance**

**Manager(s):** Robert Mulderig, Deputy Director for Residential & Community Services

**Supervisor(s):** Victor Selman, Chief Operating Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department of Housing and Community Development significantly exceeded expectations for the Homeownership and Home Rehabilitation Assistance Program. Both of this Program's two measures' targets were surpassed.

Measure 1.1: Rate of households receiving Home Purchase Assistance (HPAP) down payment and closing cost assistance

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	240	33	31	33	33
Actual	231	28.12	31.7	40.19	-

Note: FY 2007 target increased from 31 to 33 percent of households receiving a Notice of Eligibility (approximately 240 households annually).

Measure 1.2: Rate of households receiving single-family home rehabilitation assistance to new qualified applications for assistance

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	35	50	60	60	60
Actual	29	88.03	97.8	84.21	-

Note: In FY 2005, the target rate of 50% was based on a pool of 70 applications; the FY 2006-2007 target rate of 60% is based on a pool of 100 applications.

### **Program 2: Affordable Housing/Real Estate Development**

**Manager(s):** James Thackaberry, Interim Development Finance Manager

**Supervisor(s):** Victor Selman, Chief Operating Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, DHCD exceeded expectations for this Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of RFP funds allocated by end of fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	90	90	90	90
Actual	97.6	166.62	218.6	254.78	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of affordable housing units funded

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	107.23	139	102.55	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006 referring to 1508 units. FY 2007-2008 targets are based on 2,000 units. Formerly KRMs 2.2 and 2.3. FY 2005 Actual reflects the combined score of the previous KRMs.

Measure 2.3:	Percent of target number families assisted to convert apartments				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	200	100	100	100	100
Actual	109	100	100	100	-
Note: The FY 2005-2008 targets refer to 100% of 150 units.					

Measure 2.4:	Percent of tenant organizations and households provided training, management and other assistance for first right to purchase and apartment conversion				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	4000	100	100	100	100
Actual	6665	89.42	100	100	-
Note: The FY 2005-2006 targets refer to 100% of 4000 households reached through tenant organizations. The FY 2006-2008 targets refer to 100% of 1700 families assisted through tenant organizations. (3/06)					

**Program 3: Neighborhood Investment**

*Manager(s):* Robert Mulderig, Deputy Director for Residential & Community Services;

*Supervisor(s):* Victor Selman, Chief Operating Officer

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the agency exceeded expectations for this goal.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of businesses applying for technical assistance services to those for which services are successfully provided				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	300	98	95	95	95
Actual	1581	93.52	87.5	87.64	-
Note: The FY 2005-2008 targets reflect a percent value on a projected target base of 1500 businesses.					

Measure 3.2:	Percent of households applying for housing counseling services to those for which services are successfully provided				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	4000	96	95	95	95
Actual	9331	95.32	71	102.36	-
Note: The FY 2005-2008 targets are percent values on a projected target base of 7992 households counseled.					

**Program 4: Emergency Shelter Grant Management**

*Manager(s):* James Thackaberry, Interim Development Finance Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Victor Selman, Chief Operating Officer

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DCHD met expectations for the Emergency Shelter Grant Management Program.

Measure 4.1:	Percentage of Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds appropriately spent within two years of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	0	49.4	-

Measure 4.2:	Percentage of households assisted with emergency eviction prevention grants				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	281	100	100	100	100
Actual	395	43.54	114.6	146.15	-
Note: The FY 2005-2006 targets refer to 100% of 271 households.					

**Program 5: Economic and Commercial Development**

*Manager(s):* Perry Perry, Manager, Property Acquisition and Disposition Division

*Supervisor(s):* Victor Selman, Chief Operating Officer

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DHCD significantly exceeded expectations for the Economic and Commercial Development Program.

Measure 5.1:	Percent inventory of properties maintained on schedule				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	80	90	90	90
Actual	87.2	89.13	93.5	99.45	-
Note: FY 2005 target increased from 75 to 80 at the request of the agency (1/10/05).					

**Program 6: Program Monitoring and Compliance**

*Manager(s):* Michelle Christopher, Compliance Officer, Office of Program Monitoring

*Supervisor(s):* Colleen BonnickLewis, Chief of Staff

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC DHCD significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing the targets for both measures in the Program Monitoring and Compliance Program.

Measure 6.1:	Percent of Environmental Reviews (ERs) completed within 45 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	94	92.16	89.7	92.73	-

Measure 6.2:	Percent reduction of CAFR, A133 and HUD findings				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	50	50	50	50
Actual	53	62.5	-	100	-

**Program 7: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Robert Trent, Chief Administrative Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Leila Finucane Edmonds, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 7.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	55.6	87.5	-	-

Measure 7.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	77.8	75	78.5	84.6	-

## ***Department of Employment Services (CF0)***

### **Program 1: Unemployment Insurance**

**Manager(s):** Frank Orlando, Associate Director

**Supervisor(s):** Vacant, Administrative Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC DOES significantly exceeded both targets for the performance measures in the Unemployment Insurance Program. Overall, the agency significantly exceeded expectations for this program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of new unemployment insurance status determinations made within 90 days of the ending date of the first quarter of liability [Please note: This measure will not be part of the FY 2008 Agency Performance Plan]

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	60	60	60	70
Actual	77.38	84.37	81.62	86.32	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of all intrastate first unemployment insurance payments made within 14 days of the first compensable week-ending date

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	85	87	90
Actual	76.80	86.72	89.72	92.22	-

### **Program 2: Labor Standards**

**Manager(s):** Mohammad Sheikh, Acting Assistant Director

**Supervisor(s):** Summer Spencer, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC DOES significantly exceeded three targets, met expectations on one target, and needs improvement on one target for the five performance measures in the Labor Standards Program. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations for this program. The agency has added the following commentary:

KRM 2.4: "The September 2007 goal was not met (4.51% below target). However, the fiscal year KRM total is scored at "90% and above" of the projected target of 80%. Based on the city's scoring system, this measure achieved an acceptable outcome. The program's struggle to consistently meet its target has stemmed from two central issues: an existing backlog problem coupled with persistent staffing problems. Accordingly, the agency developed corrective action plans to facilitate future program success. One plan focused existing resources toward the resolution of past due cases while simultaneously maintaining timely resolution of current matters. This effort has resulted in the reduction of the backlog from 149 (as of June 30, 2007) to 92 (as of September 30, 2007). In addition, in FY 2008, the program has initiated a recruitment campaign through the D.C. Department of Human Resources for five Administrative Law Judges (ALJs). This represents four new ALJ positions and one ALJ replacement (the program lost an ALJ in 2007). The agency anticipates at least two eventual outcomes: that the persistent backlog will be further reduced as a result of a full complement of staff; that the program will increase its overall achievement in Fiscal Year 2008."

KRM 2.5: "The September 2007 goal was met. However, the annual target was not achieved and the KRM results scored a two based on the city's six-point rating scale. The agency previously noted that Fiscal Year 2007 represented the baseline year for this measure, and the projected target of 80% proved to be ambitious. Due to the aforementioned, the agency recommended to the Office of the City

Administrator (OCA) that the target be reduced to 70% for future fiscal years.”

Measure 2.1:	Percent of back wages collected from employers on valid complaints	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	75	75	95
	Actual	91.20	97.79	97.08	96.88	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of serious workplace hazards identified during private-sector OSH consultation visits corrected by the abatement date	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	88.29	96.13	98.51	98.4	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of “Memorandum of Informal Conferences” issued within 20 working days following conduct of informal conferences to resolve disputed issues	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	75	75	85
	Actual	67.37	90.71	85.75	86.47	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of applications for formal hearings resolved within 120 working days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	80	80	80
	Actual	N/A	N/A	79.06	75.49	-

Measure 2.5:	Percent of Compensation Review Board (CRB) written reviews of case decisions issued by Administrative Hearings Division (AHD) and/or Office of Workers’ Compensation (OWC) completed within 45 working days of the appeal (Application for Review)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	69.82	-

Note: This is a new measure for 2007 developed as a result of a realignment of the Office of Hearings and Adjudication (OHA) due to implementation of amendments to the 2005 Budget Support Act of 2004 which resulted in a name change of OHA to Administrative Hearings Division (AHD) and the creation of the Compensation Review Board.

**Program 3: Workforce Development**  
**Manager(s):** Vacant, Administrative Officer  
**Supervisor(s):** Summer Spencer, Agency Director

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC DOES significantly exceeded expectations for the Workforce Development Program. Five measures significantly exceeded expectations, and three measures met or exceeded expectations.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of senior service slot enrollees placed in unsubsidized jobs	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	20	20	26	29	37
	Actual	33.06	37.5	34.71	34.62	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of training providers furnished technical assistance through formal instruction				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	90.12	90.36	91.76	91.09	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of District residents enrolled in pre-apprenticeship training transitioning to formal apprenticeship				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	50	50	50	50
Actual	51.09	58.18	50	61.93	-

Note: Per agency request, the KRM wording was changed from “Percent of District residents successfully completing pre-apprenticeship training transitioning to formal apprenticeship” to accurately reflect the source of the demand data (4/24/06).

Measure 3.4:	Percent of Transitional Employment Program (TEP) participants who enroll in subsidized employment transitioning to unsubsidized employment				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	40	40	40
Actual	N/A	N/A	42.34	60.82	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 replaces previous KRM 3.4 of “Percent of TANF/Welfare-to-Work participants who enter subsidized employment transitioning to unsubsidized employment” following the May 2005 program termination. The FY 2004 and FY 2005 Actuals for this terminated program were as follows: 71.12% (FY04) and 62.82% (FY05) (2/17/06). Per agency request, the KRM wording changed from “Percent of Transitional employment Program participants transitioning to unsubsidized employment” to accurately reflect output and demand data. (4/24/06).

Measure 3.5:	Percent of the top 200 employers listing jobs with DOES				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	20	20	20	30
Actual	42	41.5	45	47	-

Measure 3.6:	Percent of unemployed adult customers placed in full-time unsubsidized employment				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	65	70	70	70	70
Actual	71.57	71.32	77.43	79.24	-

Measure 3.7:	Percentage of youth advancing from one grade level to another (school retention)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	54	54	54	56
Actual	N/A	54	54	54	-

Measure 3.8:	Percent of data, estimates, reports and publications submitted within established timeframes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	98.15	96.96	96.54	96.16	-

**Program 4: Agency Management**  
*Supervisor(s):* Summer Spencer, Director

**Program Results:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	58.1	51.85	-	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	87.5	86.7	93	86.7	-

## ***Board of Real Property Assessments and Appeals (DA0)***

### **Program 1: Real Property Assessment Appeal Process**

*Manager(s):* Doretha McCallum, Administrative Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Ron Collins, Director, Executive Office of the Mayor for Boards and Commissions

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Board of Real Property Assessments and Appeals has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of cases received and processed					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	37.33	-	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of all decisions mailed within 15 days of the date of disposition					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	86.04	100	-	-

### **Program 2: Real Property Outreach Education**

*Manager(s):* Doretha McCallum, Administrative Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Ron Collins, Director, Executive Office of the Mayor for Boards and Commissions

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Board of Real Property Assessments and Appeals has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of property owners educated about their appeal rights and procedures					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	-	-

### **Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Doretha McCallum, Administrative Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Ron Collins, Director, Executive Office of the Mayor for Boards and Commissions

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Board of Real Property Assessments and Appeals has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2006					

Measure 3.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	100	100	-	-

## Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (CR0)

### Program 1: Licensing and Permitting

**Manager(s):** Lennox Douglas, (A) Deputy Director for Permitting and Joseph Schilling, Division Chief, Licensing Operations

**Supervisor(s):** Linda K. Argo, Director

### Program Result: Needs Improvement

DCRA met one of the five targets, however, did not meet the remaining four key result measures in these program areas. Overall, DCRA is showing improvement from FY 2006 in plans reviewed within allocated 30 day timeframe and also in the average processing time for express permits. .

Measure 1.1: Percent of complex plans reviewed within allocated days (30 calendar days)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	45.4	68.5	-

Note: For FY 2007 replaces prior "Measure 1.1: Percent of plans reviewed within allocated days" and separates complex and non-complex plan review data collection. FY 2007 measure is 30 calendar days.

Measure 1.2: Percent of non-complex plans reviewed within allocated days (14 calendar days)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	83.5	50.8	-

Note: For FY 2007 replaces prior "Measure 1.1: Percent of plans reviewed within allocated days" and separates complex and non-complex plan review data collection. FY 2007 measure is 14 calendar days.

Measure 1.3: Percent of express building permits issued within an identified average processing time (24 hours)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	30	95	95	95	95
Actual	23	63.69	73.3	81.5	-

Note: For FY 2007 average processing time is 24 hours. Measure name revised from "walk-in" to "express."(3/2007)

Measure 1.4: Percent of permit-related building inspections completed within 48 hours of the request

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	97.1	97.61	99.6	67.9	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of identified businesses operating in the District of Columbia that have a current basic business license

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	100	100	95	95
Actual	108.5	100	100	100	-

Note: For FY 2007 measure covers the identified businesses, including renewals, that have a current basic business license.

**Program 2: Inspections and Enforcement***Manager(s):* Nicholas Majett, Deputy Director, Inspections and Compliance*Supervisor(s):* Linda K. Argo, Director**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DCRA exceeded two of the four targets for FY 2007 in Inspections and Enforcement Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of business license investigations completed within allocated days (# of days)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	100	99.05	99.9	100	-

Note: FY 2007 target is percent of investigations completed within specific timeframes, which vary by type of investigation. "Business license" inserted for clarity. (3/2007)

Measure 2.2:	Percent of vacant and abandoned housing units brought into compliance and/or alternative corrective methods to remove blight conditions initiated				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	77	-

Note: For FY 2007 replaces "Percent of vacant and abandoned housing units brought into compliance." "Brought into compliance" refers to compliance with DCMR Title 14. "Alternative corrective methods" are DCRA referrals for additional enforcement action to abate blighted conditions (condemnation, referral to Home Again, etc).

Measure 2.3:	Percent of commercial weighing/measuring devices investigated bi-annually (# of devices)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	9414	95	95	95	95
Actual	10793	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of emergency complaints resolved within 48 hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	96	96	95
Actual	97.8	98.46	99.9	76	-

Note: "Responded to" replaced by "resolved" for clarity and to reflect enhanced accountability. (3/2007)

**Program 3: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Linda K. Argo, Director*Supervisor(s):* Linda K. Argo, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	51.6	25	-	-
Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	80	70	33	-

## ***Commission on the Arts and Humanities (BX0)***

### **Program 1: Arts Building Communities**

*Manager(s):* Lionell Thomas, Assistant Director

*Supervisor(s):* Anthony Gittens, Executive Director

### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Commission on the Arts and Humanities has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1: Percent change in number of grants awarded

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	400	10	10	10	10
Actual	406	5.91	6.98	-	-

Measure 1.2: Percent change in showcases, presentations and cultural opportunities offered

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	300	12	10	10	10
Actual	302	5.96	10.94	-	-

Measure 1.3: Percent change in major partnerships developed in the arts

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	2	5	5	5
Actual	30	6.67	43.75	-	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of DC residents served

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	45	50	55	60	60
Actual	45	50	56.08	-	-

### **Program 2: DC Creates Public Art**

*Manager(s):* Rachel Dickerson, Art in Public Places Program Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Lionell Thomas, Assistant Director

### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Commission on the Arts and Humanities has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1: Percent change in new Art Bank installations

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10	15	5	5	5
Actual	11	16	-	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Art Bank placements installed on-time

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	75	75	75	75
Actual	75	63	86.71	-	-

Note: FY 2006-2007 targets increased from 17 and 23, respectively, to 75 percent at agency request (3/10/06).

**Program 3: Arts Learning and Outreach***Supervisor(s):* Anthony Gittens, Executive Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Commission on the Arts and Humanities has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1: Percent of DC public school students served

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	55	55	60	65
Actual	56	56.64	56	-	-

Note: Agency requested to change the previously reported FY 2006 Actual data 103.1%, that resulted due to error in calculations (2/12/07).

Measure 3.2: Percent change in grant applications received

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10	15	15	15	15
Actual	10	0.42	42.38	-	-

**Program 4: Administration***Manager(s):* Lionell Thomas, Assistant Director*Supervisor(s):* Anthony Gittens, Executive Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Commission on the Arts and Humanities has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 4.1: Percent change in funded grant applications

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	15	20	10	10	10
Actual	15	6	47.91	-	-

**Program 5: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Lionell Thomas, Assistant Director*Supervisor(s):* Anthony Gittens, Executive Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Commission on the Arts and Humanities has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 5.1: Percent of variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	2.98	-	-

Measure 5.2: Cost of Risk

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	120439	-	-

Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	66.67	37.5	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	50	73	-	-

## ***Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (LQ0)***

### **Program 1: Licensing**

*Manager(s):* Laura Byrd, Program Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Maria Delaney, Director

### **Program Result: No Rating**

The Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (LQ0) does not provide any targets for its Key Result Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 1.1:	Number of new ABC licenses and permits issued	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	979	1000	1254	1413	-
Measure 1.2:	Number of ABC licenses and permits renewed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	1011	1555	221	2434	-
Measure 1.3:	Number of Import Permits & Keg Registrations issued	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	16390	22644	22540	-
Measure 1.4:	Number of ABC licenses transferred	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	133	108	118	133	-
Measure 1.5:	Number of non-renewable licenses issued (Temporary)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	429	373	285	212	-
Measure 1.6:	Number of notices sent to the Council	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	962	463	612	272	-
Measure 1.7:	Number of ANC notifications issued	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	1130	357	2864	2342	-

**Program 2: Enforcement***Manager(s):* Johnnie Jackson, Chief Investigator*Supervisor(s):* Maria Delaney, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (LQ0) does not provide any targets for its Key Result Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 2.1: Number of regulatory inspections &amp; investigations performed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	3042	4026	2255	6786	-

Measure 2.2: Number of establishments inspected to ensure compliance with underage drinking laws

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	470	265	366	682	-

**Program 3: Legal Services***Manager(s):* Fred Moosally, General Counsel*Supervisor(s):* Maria Delaney, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (LQ0) does not provide any targets for its Key Result Measures (KRMs), except for the KRM 3.1 (Percentage of licensees who are forwarded the Board's written decision by certified mail within 5 days) and 3.2 (Percent of cases of compliance checks settled by staff). Based on these two KRMs the agency's performance in this program is rated.

Measure 3.1: Percentage of licensees who are forwarded the Board's written decision by certified mail within 5 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	100	100	N/A
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of cases of compliance checks settled by staff

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	60	60	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	98	92	-

Measure 3.3: Number of adjudicated cases processed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	318	283	333	524	-

Measure 3.4: Number of Board approved voluntary agreements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	64	46	57	77	-

Measure 3.5:	Number of hearings conducted by the Board	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	546	530	606	626	-

Measure 3.6:	Number of fines and citations	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	72	95	787	-

Measure 3.7:	Number of ABC licenses suspended	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	40	18	38	138	-

Measure 3.8:	Number of ABC licenses revoked	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	0	2	1	0	-

**Program 4: Records Management**

*Manager(s):* Farouk Hosein

*Supervisor(s):* Maria Delaney, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (LQ0) does not provide any targets for its Key Result Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 4.1:	Amount of revenue generated by ABC in dollars	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	3239800	4076283	3606271	4850572	-

Measure 4.2:	Amount of Fines in dollars	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	146150	156719	104085	361573	-

Measure 4.3:	Number of civic association, business, Neighborhood Core meetings, and ANC meetings attended by staff or Board members, including trainings in Title 25 of the DC Official Code and Title 23 DCMR	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	175	213	122	139	-

**Program 5: Agency Management**  
**Manager(s):** Farouk Hosein  
**Supervisor(s):** Maria Delaney, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because no measures have data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	33.3	39	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	75	-	-	-

## ***Public Service Commission (DH0)***

### **Program 1: Utilities Regulation Program**

**Manager(s):** Richard A. Beverly, Esq. and Dr. Phylcia Fauntleroy Bowman, Executive Director

**Supervisor(s):** Agnes A. Yates, Chairperson

### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Public Service Commission significantly exceeded expectations for the Utilities Regulation Program. Five of FY 2007's targets were met or significantly exceeded

Measure 1.1: Percent of electric service quality standards not met for which plans for improvement have been requested and implemented

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of gas quality of service standards not met for which plans for improvement have been requested and implemented

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of local telecommunications service quality standards not met for which plans for improvement have been requested and implemented

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of rate cases completed within nine months

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	-	0	-

Note: This measure was not considered for rating agency's performance in FY 2006 because there were no rate cases in that year. Thus, the PSC did not fail this measure in FY 2006 (12/28/06). There were two rate cases (Washington Gas and PEPCO) filed in December 2006. Thus, Commission decisions were due by the end of September 2007. Neither case was completed in 9 months. The Washington Gas rate case was not completed because the Company failed to comply with Commission orders to provide a copy of its outsourcing contract to the Commission and the parties, causing hearings scheduled for August 2007 to be cancelled, unanticipated litigation, and the Commission's levying of a \$350,000 forfeiture on WGL. The case restarted in October 2007. In December 2007, a joint non-unanimous settlement agreement was filed; the Commission held a public interest hearing, and a final order was issued on December 28, 2007.

The PEPCO rate case was not completed on a timely basis.

Measure 1.5: Percent of completed electric licensing applications processed within 45 calendar days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Note: Per agency request, KRM wording is changed to include the word "completed" before "electric licensing applications" (4/20/06).

Measure 1.6:	Percent of completed gas licensing applications processed within 20 calendar days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	91.67	33.33	100	100	-
Note: Per agency request, KRM wording is changed to include the word "completed" before "gas licensing applications" (4/20/06).					

Measure 1.7:	Percent of telecommunications licensing orders and deficiency letters processed within 15 business days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	90	90	95	90
Actual	94.59	97.37	100	100	-
Note: The targets in the FY 2005-2006 Strategic Plan were 90% to conform to the newly created performance measures for processing electric and gas applications. As per agency request, the measure wording was changed to remove "(of receipt of all required information)" (4/20/06).					

Measure 1.8:	Percent of consumers responding to surveys/evaluations that rate outreach activities/services as good or better				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	95.35	94.44	100	93.75	-

Measure 1.9:	Percent of consumer complaints resolved informally within 10 working days.				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	65	65	65
Actual	N/A	N/A	64.71	68.05	-

**Program 2: Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Program**

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Phylcia Fauntleroy Bowman, Executive Director and Agnes A. Yates, Chairperson

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Results for the Gas Pipeline Safety Program are supplied by the US DOT based on its compliance audit findings. The Public Service Commission achieved a score of 98%, surpassing the target of 90%, and significantly exceeded expectations for this program.

Measure 2.1:	U.S. Department of Transportation audit compliance rating in percent				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	100	100	96	98	-

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Dr. Phylcia Fauntleroy Bowman, Executive Director and Jesse P. Clay, Jr., Deputy Executive Director for Administrative Matters

*Supervisor(s):* Agnes A. Yates, Chairperson

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	4.83	1.73	1.43	-	-
Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service standards met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	41	58	-	-
Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	83	100	88.9	-

## Office of the People's Counsel (DJ0)

### Program 1: People's Counsel

Manager(s): Sandra Mattavous-Frye & Herbert H. Jones

Supervisor(s): Elizabeth A. Noel, Esq., People's Counsel

### Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

Office of the People's Counsel exceeded expectations for its three targets.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of consumer complaints resolved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	75	75	75	75
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of survey respondents indicating increased knowledge of utility issues					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	55	55	55	55
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	98	-

Measure 1.3:	Percent change in utility requests for rate increases					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	65	65	65	65
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

### Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Derryl Stewart King & Darlene Williams-Wake

Supervisor(s): Elizabeth A. Noel, Esq., People's Counsel

### Program Result: No Rating

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2006.					

Measure 2.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	67	-

## ***Department of Insurance, Securities and Banking (SR0)***

### **Program 1: Insurance Bureau**

**Manager(s):** Philip Barlow, Associate Commissioner for Insurance

**Supervisor(s):** Thomas E. Hampton, Commissioner

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Department of Insurance, Securities and Banking exceeded expectations for the Insurance Bureau Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of electronic form filings approved, accepted or rejected within 30 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	93	97.98	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006.

Measure 1.2: Percent of hard copy policy forms processed as accepted or rejected within 45 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	92	92	92
Actual	98	95.98	91.8	96.09	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of licensed domestic insurance company examinations finalized within a fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Note: Measure name was originally "Percent of licensed domestic insurance companies examined within a fiscal year." Revised to more precisely describe agency activity. (1/20/2006) One third of companies are required to be examined each year: the target represents 100% of this required one third.

Measure 1.4: Percent of written complaints that are resolved within 45 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	98	100	65.6	62.36	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of premium rate filings reviewed within statutory time frame

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	88.16	91.7	89.8	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2005 performance reported as a baseline for setting FY 2006-2008 targets (1/23/2006).

Measure 1.6: Percent of domestic insurance company financial analyses completed in accordance with department/NAIC guidelines

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006.

Measure 1.7:	Percent of market conduct level I analyses completed				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	95.32	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007.					

Measure 1.8:	Percent of foreign company license applications approved and issued within 45 days of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	92.31	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007.					

**Program 2: Securities Bureau**

*Manager(s):* Theodore Miles, Associate Commissioner for Securities

*Supervisor(s):* Thomas E. Hampton, Commissioner

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC DISB exceeded expectations for the Securities Bureau Program. Two of this program's four targets were surpassed while the third met expectations and the fourth significantly surpassed expectations.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of the securities registrations cleared by the Securities Bureau within 60 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	98	86.11	85.1	87.84	-
Note: Previously written as "Percent of the securities offerings reviewed by Securities Bureau".					

Measure 2.2:	Percent of DC-based investment advisor firms examined within 12 months				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10	15	15	15	20
Actual	10	22.4	28.2	33.61	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of the broker dealer and investment advisor firm licenses processed within 30 days of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	93	93	95	93
Actual	96	98.5	99	98.94	-
Note: Previously written as "Percent of the applications process completed within 25 days". Timeframe amended from 25 to 30 days in response to OIG findings, per agency request. (4/14/2006)					

Measure 2.4:	Percent of securities notice filings processed within 30 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	95	100	95
Actual	N/A	100	95.1	99.58	-
Note: Previously reported as "Securities Offerings acknowledged within 30 days." Calculation of this performance measure was revised by the agency in mid-FY 2005. FY 2005 serves as a baseline year for setting future performance targets. (1/23/2006) FY 2006 target corrected from 100% to 95%. (4/14/2006)					

**Program 3: Enforcement Bureau***Manager(s):* Stephen Perry, Associate Commissioner for Enforcement and Investigations*Supervisor(s):* Thomas E. Hampton, Commissioner**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DISB significantly exceeded expectations for the Enforcement Bureau by meeting the target for one and surpassing the target for the other of this program's two KRMs.

Measure 3.1: Percent of insurance company anti-fraud plans reviewed within 15 days of receipt.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Note: Previously written as "Percent compliance with filings of insurance anti-fraud plans within 6 months of licensing date". Measure name further revised from "Percent of insurance company anti-fraud plans filed and reviewed within 6 months of company licensing date". Timeframe changed from 30 to 15 days at Council and agency request. (3/2007)

Measure 3.2: Percent of open investigative cases reviewed within 90 days for correctness and compliance with investigative procedures.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	80	80	85
Actual	N/A	90.16	96.4	98.1	

Note: This measure has been modified from the original wording, "cases closed". The agency is responsible for providing a completed investigative case file. Cases are closed after consultation with the US Attorney Office and other staff outside of DISB. Measure name further revised from, "Percent of investigative cases completed within 90 days" to more fully describe agency activity (1/20/2006).

**Program 4: Banking Bureau***Manager(s):* Howard Amer, Associate Commissioner for Banking*Supervisor(s):* Thomas Hampton, Commissioner**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC DISB significantly exceeded expectations for the Banking Bureau Program. Results for three of this program's four measures significantly surpassed expectations while the fourth measure met expectations.

Measure 4.1: Percent of BankingBureau@DC.gov email enquiries resolved within 5 business days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	96.7	97.8	-

Note: New measure FY 2006

Measure 4.2: Percent of non-depository institution examinations completed within 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	86.24	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 4.3:	Percent of written consumer complaints resolved within 45 days of receipt				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	95	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	98.6	100	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006.					

Measure 4.4:	Percent of non-depository financial institutions applications (initial and renewal) completed and processed				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	70	75	75	85
Actual	N/A	129	90.3	88.63	-
Note: Measure revised from "Percent of financial institution applications (initial and renewal) processed by the Department within 45 days of receipt as completed application" in mid-FY 2005 (1/23/2006).					

**Program 5: Risk Financing Bureau**

*Manager(s):* Dana Sheppard, Associate Commissioner for Risk Finance

*Supervisor(s):* Thomas Hampton, Commissioner

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC DISB significantly exceeded expectations for the Risk Financing Program. The targets for the Risk Financing Bureau were significantly surpassed.

Measure 5.1:	Percent of captive insurance company applications processed within 30 days of receipt of completed application				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
Note: New measure for FY 2005.					

Measure 5.2:	Percent of captive insurance companies financial analyses completed in accordance with department/NAIC guidelines.				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	95	95	95
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	97.12	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. Title formerly, "Percent of captive insurance companies examined within statutory timeframes."					

**Program 6: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Thomas Hampton, Commissioner

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 6.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 6.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 6.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	55.6	37.5	-	-
Measure 6.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	86.7	78.9	65	-

## ***Office of Cable Television (CT0)***

### **Program 1: Programming**

*Manager(s):* Karen Tolson, Director of Programming

*Supervisor(s):* Eric Richardson, Interim Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

OCT met one of this program's targets by increasing its number of programs by one, and surpassed its target of providing production rates 20% less expensive than the private sector's. Overall OCT exceeded expectations for Programming.

Measure 1.1: Increase in programming

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	2	2	1	1	1
Actual	2	2	2	1	-

Note: This measure is referring to the actual increase in the number of new, original television programs.

Measure 1.2: Percent savings that OCT television production rates offer District agencies in comparison with the average, comparable quality, private sector, general market television production rates

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	20	20	20	20
Actual	20	20.65	20.65	20.65	-

Note: FY 2007 target decreased from 25 to 20 percent at agency request (2/9/06).

### **Program 2: Regulatory**

*Manager(s):* Gordon Boelter, Assistant Attorney General

*Supervisor(s):* Carl Wilson, General Counsel

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

OCT significantly exceeded expectations for the Regulatory Program by surpassing the targets for both measures in this program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of OCT identified system failures or irregularities resolved within two business days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	90	90	90
Actual	97	98.2	100	100	-

### **Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Karen Tolson, Director of Programming

*Supervisor(s):* Eric Richardson, Interim Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	77.8	92	-	-
Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter C: Public Safety and Justice**

**March 2008**

---

## ***Metropolitan Police Department (FA0)***

### **Program 1: Regional Field Operations**

**Manager(s):** Willie Dandridge, Assistant Chief; Brian Jordan, Assistant Chief;  
Peter Newsham, Assistant Chief

**Supervisor(s):** Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

### **Program Result: *Met Expectations***

The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) significantly exceeded expectations on three measures, met expectations on two measures, needs improvement on five measures, and could not submit data for performance on two measures (KRM 1.4 and 1.9).

Although the Department did not meet the target 10 percent reduction in violent crime, preliminary figures indicate that violent crimes were down or about the same as last fiscal year. Sexual assaults were down 18 percent, assaults with a dangerous weapon were down 6 percent, and there was a 2 percent reduction in robbery. There was one more homicide in FY 2007 than in FY 2006.

In addition, although MPD did not meet the target 10 percent reduction in property crime, preliminary figures indicate that burglaries and stolen autos dropped (4 percent and 3 percent, respectively), while thefts are on the rise (theft from vehicles, up 3 percent, other thefts, up 9 percent).

#### **Measure 1.1: Percent change in DC Code Index violent crime**

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
Actual	-13.5	-5.8	3.9	-4.3	-

Note: DC Code Index violent crime includes homicide, sexual assault, assault with a deadly weapon and robbery. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics on Part I crimes submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

#### **Measure 1.2: Percent change in DC Code Index property crime**

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
Actual	-13.7	-10.2	-3.4	2.2	-

Note: DC Code Index property crime includes burglary, theft from auto, other theft, stolen auto and arson. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics on Part I crimes submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

#### **Measure 1.3: Rate of sustained citizen allegations of police misconduct per 1,000 sworn members**

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	35.9	35.8	34.8	20.8	-2
Actual	36.5	35.5	21.2	15.7	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.4: Percent of victims surveyed reporting that they were victimized more than once in the past three months

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10.2	18.6	-2	-2	-2
Actual	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 1.5: Average number of city blocks with 15 or more repeat calls for service for public disorder within a month

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	61.1	62.1	65.9	64.9	-5
Actual	65.4	68.3	68.3	73.6	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.6: Average number of city blocks with 12 or more repeat calls for service for drug activity within a month

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	14.8	14.4	6.6	6.5	-5
Actual	15.2	6.9	6.8	6.1	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.7: Number of addresses with three or more repeat calls for service for domestic violence during the fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	717	944	726	848	-2
Actual	963	741	865	719	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.8: Average response time (in minutes) to Priority One calls from time of dispatch to the arrival of the first officer on the scene

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	8.24	8.16	7.69	7.29	-2
Actual	8.33	7.85	7.44	7.89	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.9: Percent of victims of crime reporting that they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the initial police services they received when they were victims of crime

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	78	74.3	2	2	2
Actual	72.8	N/A	-	-	-

Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 1.10:	Percent of lieutenants, sergeants, and officers assigned to the Police Service Areas					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	62	62	62	62	62
	Actual	59.2	61.6	64.7	63.4	-

Measure 1.11:	Ratio of Part 1 arrests of youth offenders to detentions or arrests of youth for all crimes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	0.35	0.33	0.27	0.28	-2
	Actual	0.34	0.28	0.29	0.28	-
	Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).					

Measure 1.12:	Number of vehicle crashes with fatalities					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	54	50	39	39	-3
	Actual	52	40	40	42	-
	Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).					

**Program 2: Investigative Field Operations**

*Manager(s):* Winston Robinson, Assistant Chief

*Supervisor(s):* Michael J. Fitzgerald, Executive Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

MPD did not meet two targets, and could not submit data for performance on 9 measures (KRM 2.1-2.8, 2.11). The Uniform Crime Report clearance rates (KRM 2.2-2.8, 2.11) are reported on a calendar year basis (January-December) consistent with the FBI reporting requirements. The Department will report results for 2007 for this measure in spring 2008. In 2006, MPD achieved clearance rates well above the average of comparably sized cities in four of seven clearance rates: homicide, rape, aggravated assault, and burglary. Although clearance rates for robbery and larceny-theft have been lower than comparable averages in the past, they have been on the rise.

Lastly, MPD's clearance rate for motor vehicle theft will be lower than observed in other jurisdictions because the department adheres to strict FBI guidelines in calculating the clearance rate. Like many jurisdictions, MPD makes far more arrests for a charge with a lower evidentiary standard—Unauthorized Use of a Vehicle (UUV)—because there is rarely enough evidence to prove that an individual stole a vehicle. Anecdotal feedback from the FBI and a survey of MPD's benchmark cities revealed that many agencies that are reporting a higher clearance rate close motor vehicle theft cases with an arrest for a charge similar to UUV, and are therefore not in compliance with FBI guidelines.

In 2006, MPD began tracking a performance measure that reflects arrests for both **auto theft** and **UUV**. Although neither of these measures is exactly comparable with the annual FBI UCR MVT figure because reporting cities are not using a consistent methodology, having the two measures on auto theft investigations demonstrates that MPD is maintaining professional standards, while at the same time providing a more complete and accurate picture of auto theft investigation in the District of Columbia. MPD's 2006 results (19.4 percent for CY 2006) are consistent with agencies which include arrests for UUV or related charges in their clearance rates.

Measure 2.1: Percent of victims of crime reporting that they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the follow-up contact from a detective that they received when they were victims of crime

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70.5	2	2	2
Actual	69.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Note: Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 2.2: Homicide clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	64	67	70	70	70
Actual	60.6	61	64.5	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. The target is to achieve a 70 percent clearance rate, which is significantly higher than the 52.3 percent average clearance rate of all comparably sized cities (population 500,000 to 999,999) as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.3: Forcible rape clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	48.8	62.3	73	73	73
Actual	59.3	73.7	73.6	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to maintain a 73 percent clearance rate, which is significantly higher than the benchmark average of 36.1 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.4: Robbery clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20.8	23	20.3	19.8	5
Actual	14	15.7	16.1	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (18.9% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.5: Aggravated assault clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	49.4	50.3	55	55	55
Actual	47	52.7	52.5	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to reach and then maintain a 55 percent clearance rate, which is higher than the benchmark average of 45.7 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.6: Burglary clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	14.3	10.9	19.8	20	20
Actual	9	18.9	17.4	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to reach and then maintain a 20 percent clearance rate, which is more than twice as high as the benchmark average of 8.7 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.7: Larceny-theft clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	13.8	13.5	13.4	13.8	5
Actual	6.7	8.1	8.8	-	-

Note: Clearance rates are reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (13.1% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.8: Motor vehicle theft clearance rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10.8	10.5	9.2	10.1	5
Actual	1.8	1.9	2.1	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (9.6% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.9: Percent of child abuse cases resolved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	72.6	85.1	85	85	85
Actual	51.1	81.1	89.9	72.6	-

Note: This measure was revised in FY 2005. The previous measure was based on strict FBI reporting guidelines for clearance rates. Since the FBI does not report clearance rates related to child abuse, and there is no other national standard for benchmark comparisons, there is little value in adhering to the FBI clearance rate definition that is not appropriate for child abuse investigations. The new performance measure is based on the resolution of reported cases of child abuse investigated by MPD's Youth Investigations Branch. Resolved cases include those closed by arrest or exceptional means, as well as those determined to be unfounded (incident did not occur) or unsupported (alleged offender was within his/her rights), or in which the offender is ordered into a diversion program by the court. This new measure is therefore more representative of reported child abuse in general. Future targets are to reach and then maintain an 85 percent resolution rate (1/17/08).

Measure 2.10: Court overtime hours per arrest

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3.6	2.6	2	3.1	-5
Actual	2.7	2.1	3.3	4.9	-

Note: The future targets represents percent change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 2.11: Percentage of motor vehicle thefts resolved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.4	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	19.4	-	-

Note: Future targets represent percent change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

### **Program 3: Special Field Operations**

*Manager(s):* Gerald Wilson, Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);

Alton Bigelow, Assistant Chief (January-September 2007)

*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);

Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

### **Program Result: Exceeded Expectations**

MPD exceeded expectations on both program targets. There were no instances of serious injury or significant property damage in FY 2007.

Measure 3.1: Percent of special events without serious injury or significant property damage

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of call-outs of emergency services unit without serious injury or significant property damage

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

**Program 4: Police Business Services***Manager(s):* Shannon Cockett, Assistant Chief; Ed Hamilton, Executive Director*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department significantly exceeded expectations for all three program targets.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of AFIS fingerprint database searches performed within one hour					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of prisoners processed at Central Cell Block that meets court cut-off time					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	99.7	100	99.6	99.4	-

Note: The court cut-off time is the time a prisoner is sent to the U.S. Marshal's for presentation to a judge: 1 PM Monday thru Friday and 2:30 PM on weekends; times may vary on holidays. This excludes prisoners being processed during mass demonstrations, when the volume of prisoners may significantly exceed the normal range. Because it takes approximately one hour for CCB to successfully process a prisoner, anyone logged in within one hour of cut-off time will be included in the next day's figures unless the processing takes less time than anticipated (1/17/08).

Measure 4.3:	Percent of authorized sworn strength staffed					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	98	98	98	98	98
	Actual	100	99.7	100	100.4	-

**Program 5: Organizational Change***Manager(s):* Sampson Annan, Senior Executive Director (October 2006-April 2007);  
Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director (April-August 2007);  
Joshua Ederheimer, Assistant Chief (August-September 2007)*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The primary mission of the Department is to safeguard the District of Columbia. Consistent with this mandate, Chief Cathy Lanier determined that the sworn members working on the CALEA initiative would better serve the needs of the city working in operational functions. Although MPD is not currently performing the administrative component of producing files and documentation on CALEA standards, the Department has not abandoned its efforts to become CALEA compliant. The policies and operating procedures put in place as part of the CALEA process remain in use, guiding the work of the Department. As policies and directives are revised or developed, MPD will continue to consult CALEA standards, as well as those of other professional law enforcement organizations, as important benchmarks.

Measure 5.1: CALEA Accreditation

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	70	50	100	100	100
Actual	30	62.7	68.3	-	-

Note: The figures are the percentage of standards in compliance with CALEA standards (1/11/07).

**Program 6: Professional Responsibility**

*Manager(s):* William Ponton, Assistant Chief

*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department significantly exceeded expectations for this program target.

Measure 6.1: Percent of incidents of police firearm discharges in which MPD members failed to follow Department use-of-force policies

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	8.4	14.6	7.6	21.6	6.4
Actual	15.4	8	22.7	6.7	-

Note: Policy violation findings are defined as Force Investigation Team (FIT) Final Report conclusions/ recommendations that have been signed off by the OPR Assistant Chief. The fiscal-year figure measures current-year policy violation findings, regardless of the year in which the incident took place, as a percentage of cases for which there were findings in the current year. Incidents exclude shootings at animals, and exclude unintentional and negligent firearm discharges which are not violations of the use of force policy. Future targets represent percentage change over previous year actual. (1/17/08).

**Program 7: Security Operations**

*Manager(s):* Gerald Wilson, Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);  
Alton Bigelow, Assistant Chief (January-September 2007)

*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);  
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

**Program Result:** *Below Expectations*

MPD did not meet the performance target for this measure. However, the result should be interpreted with caution, because it is based on a relatively small number of incidents. In FY 2007, the city recorded 87 more crimes on school property than in FY 2006. This includes all reported crime, regardless of the time of day, day of the week, or month of the year. Therefore these figures include incidents that take place when there are no students at school. For instance although the school year officially ended June 16, over the summer, several DCPS premises remained open for summer school and a variety of community sponsored events.

Also, since MPD assumed responsibility for managing security services at DC Public Schools, anecdotal information seems to indicate that overall reporting of criminal incidents during the school year continues to rise. This is seen primarily in two trends: incidents that previously might have gone unreported are consistently being reported to the police, and students are coming to talk with School Resource Officers (who are MPD officers) to report crimes that occur off campus.

Measure 7.1:	Percent change in DC Code Index crime at DC Public Schools				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	-10	-10	-10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-11.1	27.2	-

Note: This measure tracks all reported crimes at the exact address for all public elementary, middle, junior, and high schools and learning centers. This does not include public charter schools. All reported crime is counted, regardless of the time of day or day of week. Therefore these figures include incidents that take place when there are no students at school. DC Code Index crime includes homicide, sexual assault, assault with a dangerous weapon, robbery, burglary, theft from auto, other theft, stolen auto, and arson. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Percentages should be interpreted with caution as underlying numbers tend to be small. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

**Program 8: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director (October 2006-April 2007); Alfred Durham (April-September 2007); Ed Hamilton, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006); Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) did not meet one target, and exceeded the target for one measure. Agencies were not rated on customer service standards in FY 2007.

Measure 8.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	25	35	N/A	

Measure 8.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	59.38	82.14	68.18	57.14	-

Measure 8.3:	Average daily fleet availability				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	93	93	93	93	93
Actual	94.6	95	94.2	94.8	-

## ***Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (FB0)***

### **Program 1: Field Operations**

*Manager(s):* Lawrence Shultz, Assistant Fire Chief - Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the ten measurers within the Field Operations Program exceeded expectations.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of ALS responses to critical medical calls within eight minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	73.3	76.26	82.26	89.39	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of non-critical medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.25	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.3:	Percent of critical medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.53	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of all medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.3	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.5:	Medical calls per 1,000 with first transport unit arrival longer than 13 minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	3.7	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. Targets to be determined (5/15/06).					

Measure 1.6:	Percent change from previous year in civilian fire deaths				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-8	-9	-9	-10	-5
Actual	16	6.25	-17.65	-68	-

Measure 1.7:	Percent of hazardous materials incidents properly assessed and documented				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	93	96	98	98	96
Actual	95.2	99.69	100	100	-

Measure 1.8:	Percent of building fires confined to room of origin					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	75	75	75
	Actual	64	45.84	54.85	54.92	-

Measure 1.9:	Percent of patients in full cardiac arrest who have a pulse upon delivery to a medical facility					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. Baseline data to be collected during FY 2006 (5/15/06).					

Measure 1.10:	Percent of all diabetic, neurological, and altered mental status response patients that have their blood sugar measured in the filed prior to arriving at the hospital					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: Baseline data to be collected during FY 2007 to establish FY 2008 target (5/15/06).					

**Program 2: Prevention and Education**

*Manager(s):* Richard Fleming; Tony Dorsey, Public Information Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC FEMS significantly exceeded three of this program's four targets. Overall FEMS exceeded expectations for the Prevention and Education Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of arson cases closed with an arrest					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	13	15	20	20	17
	Actual	20.3	32.48	19.86	18.02	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent change in structure fires					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
	Actual	-4	-12.33	-24.92	-35.78	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent change in non-emergency medical calls					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
	Actual	-5.8	-0.06	-1.14	-37.89	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of building inspections completed within mandated time frames					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	98	98	95
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-

**Program 3: Employee Preparedness**

*Manager(s):* Lawrence Shultz,, Assistant Fire Chief - Operations; Thomas Herlihy, Assistant Fire Chief - Services

*Supervisor(s):* Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC FEMS exceeded expectations for the Employee Preparedness Program. All of the program's measures surpassed their targets,

Measure 3.1: Percent of employees available for full duty

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	96	96	95
Actual	95.6	96.58	97.09	97.68	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of employees meeting mandated certification requirements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	97	98	98	97
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 3.3: Percent of employees meeting mandated continuing education and re-certification requirements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	97	99	99	99
Actual	92	101.22	99.96	100	-

Measure 3.4: Percent of employees meeting annual non-mandated training goals

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	97	98	98	99
Actual	85	112.53	155.45	119.3	-

**Program 4: Operations Support**

*Manager(s):* John Burger, Deputy Fire Chief-Fleet Maintenance; Michael Willis, Deputy Fire Chief-Risk Management Division

*Supervisor(s):* Thomas Herlihy, Assistant Fire Chief - Services

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

FEMS significantly exceeded expectations in one target and exceeded expectations on one target for the two key result measures for the Operations Support program.

Measure 4.1: Percent of emergency fleet within economic retention rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 4.2: Percent change in chargeable vehicle accidents

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
Actual	72	26.39	12.09	-62.96	-

**Program 5: Agency Management***Supervisor(s):* Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	63	67	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	77.78	64.3	73	90	-

## ***Department of Corrections (FL0)***

### **Program 1: Inmate Services**

**Manager(s):** Brenda Ward, Deputy Warden-Programs

**Supervisor(s):** William Smith, Warden

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

The Department of Corrections met four targets and needs improvement on three others for the seven key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency met expectations in the Inmate Services Program.

Measure 1.1: Drug treatment program slot utilization rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	95	95	95	95
Actual	100	80.14	74.62	58.33	-

Note: The KRM's name changed from "Percent of available drug treatment slots filled" per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.2: Percent of eligible inmates referred to special education services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	35.11	92.68	39.48	74.15	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of inmate participation in outdoor recreation programs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	90	70	70	70
Actual	98.83	84.61	42.31	24.84	-

Note: DMPSJ modified the methodology for calculating this measure in FY 2006 and FY 2007. It now reflects actual inmate participation in recreational programs rather than the opportunity to take part in such programs. Per agency request "recreation" in the old KRM's name is changed to "outdoor recreation" (2/14/06).

Measure 1.4: Percent of meals in compliance with food temperature standards at point of delivery

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.04	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.5: Commissary fill rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.99	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.6: Percent of unresolved inmate grievances more than 30 days old

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	70.09	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.7:	Number of medical grievances filed per 10,000 inmate-days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	3.72	-

**Program 2: Inmate Custody**

*Manager(s):* William Smith, Warden

*Supervisor(s):* Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Department of Corrections significantly exceeded three targets, exceeded one target and did not meet two targets for the six key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in the Inmate Custody Program.

Measure 2.1:	Inmate-on-staff assault rate (assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	0.27	0.27	0.27
	Actual	24.5	5.2	1.201	0.64	-

Note: Previously calculated as number of inmate-on-staff assaults per 1,000 inmate days. Per agency request, from FY 2006 calculations will be done per 10,000 inmate-days (2/14/06). The wording "(assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)" is added to the measure name, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.2:	Inmate-on-inmate assault rate (assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	10	5	0.16	0.167	0.167
	Actual	16.41	2.5	0.102	0.068	-

Note: Previously calculated as number of inmate-on-inmate assaults per 1,000 inmate days. Per agency request, from FY 2006 calculations will be done per 10,000 inmate-days (2/14/06). The wording "(assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)" is added to the measure name, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.3:	Percent of warrants obtained for halfway house absconds within 24 hours of abscond notification (excluding weekends and holidays)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	96.19	100	-

Note: Per agency request "warrants requested for" is changed to "warrants obtained for" in the KRM name (2/14/06).

Measure 2.4:	Number of absconders per 100 days of inmate housing per halfway house					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.33	0.33
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0.41	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06). FY 2007 and 2008 targets are increased from 0.075%, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.5:	Correctional officer sick leave usage rate					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	60
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	171.49	-
	Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 2.6:	Percent of inmates in custody more than 30 days testing positive for drug use based on random sample					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	5.36	-
	Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

**Program 3: Institutional Support Services**

*Manager(s):* William Smith, Warden

*Supervisor(s):* Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The Department of Corrections significantly exceeded two targets, met three targets and needs improvement on one for the six key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency met expectations in the Institutional Support Services Program.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of appropriate housing placements based on classification level assigned					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	100	100	100	100
	Actual	95.56	93.78	93.95	97.12	-
	Note: Per agency request "based on classification level assigned" is added to the KRM name (2/14/06).					

Measure 3.2:	Delayed release rate					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	1.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5
	Actual	0.54	0.73	1.54	2.13	-
	Note: Previously calculated as percent of total releases processed beyond 48 hours of release notification. After July 2006, calculated as percent of total releases processed beyond 24 hours of notification (1/10/07).					

Measure 3.3:	Early release rate					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	1	1	0.8	0.5	0.5
	Actual	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.09	-
	Note: Calculated as percent of total releases processed earlier than official release date.					

Measure 3.4:	Percent of releases in compliance with 2003 Jail Improvement Act					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.47	-
	Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 3.5:	Priority 1 maintenance and repair completion rate (within 8 hours)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 3.6:	Average daily CDF temperature in +/- 5° F	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	74.4	-

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Devon Brown, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	2.45	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	N/A
	Actual	N/A	48.2	25	-	-

Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	81.82	70	40	52.3	-

Measure 4.5:	Federal billing reimbursement rate	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.88	-

Measure 4.6:	In service training completion rate for uniformed personnel	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	85
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	10	-

Measure 4.7:	Total employee work days lost to injury per month	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	338	338
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.8:	ACA accreditation milestone achievement rate	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.9:	Percent of OMS availability in mission critical locations	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	97	97
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.10:	Hardware obsolescence rate	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	33
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.11:	Number of stockouts of requested items	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

## ***DC National Guard (FK0)***

### **Program 1: Emergency Response**

*Manager(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

*Supervisor(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The District of Columbia National Guard has met or exceeded FY 2007 targets for this program. Overall, the agency significantly exceed expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of responses to District Emergency Community Call-up					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	55	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 55 to 100 (2/18/05).					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of support mission requests (crowd control, nuisance property abatement, abandoned vehicle removal and snow emergency supports) honored					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	92.68	106.25	-

### **Program 2: Community Support**

*Manager(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

*Supervisor(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

#### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

The District of Columbia National Guard has significantly exceeded FY 2007 targets for one and met targets for two out of five performance measures the Community Support program. Overall, the agency met expectations in this program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of new recruits who are DC residents					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	25	34	34	100
	Actual	N/A	72.62	100	100	-
	Note: At the agency request the FY 2008 target is increased from 40% (3/1/2007).					

Measure 2.2:	Percent of requests honored for participation in community events					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	80	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	95.24	96	100	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 80 to 100 per agency request (2/05).					

Measure 2.3:	Youth leader's camp completion/graduation rate					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	95	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	98.29	94.35	-
	Note: Youth leader's camp completion / graduation rate is impacted by the voluntary nature of the program.					

Measure 2.4:	ChalleNGe program completion rate					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	95	95	95	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	0	45.45	-
	Note: ChalleNGe program completion rate is determined by the availability of funding for 100 cadets, mandatory drug-testing, and the voluntary nature of the program.					

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

*Supervisor(s):* Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	100	86	67	-

## ***Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (BN0)***

### **Program 1: Preparedness and Protection**

**Manager(s):** Kathleen McDonald, Deputy Director, Acting Director of Training and Exercise. Steve Kral, Senior Policy Advisor, Acting Director for Plans and Preparedness Division

**Supervisor(s):** Darrell L. Darnell, Director

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

DC Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency's overall rating for the Preparedness and Protection Program met expectations.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of District Response Plan (DRP) update functions completed annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	100	20.83	-
Measure 1.2:	Percentage of "EMAP Maintenance Matrix" requirements that are satisfied annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.3:	Percentage of Risk Assessment/SOP/Plan inventory that is reviewed and updated annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.4:	Percentage of "all-hazards mitigation" community events participated in or conducted annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	160	117.24	150	37.5	-
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of targeted community outreach activities completed annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	280	270.83	780	66.67	-
Measure 1.6:	Percentage of centralized emergency preparedness training functions completed annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	131.25	120	160.42	-
Measure 1.7:	Percentage of necessary full-scale exercises completed annually	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	300	100	100	0	-

Measure 1.8:	Percentage of necessary tabletop exercises completed annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	175	100	80	50	-
Measure 1.9:	Percentage of emergency preparedness facilities reviewed and/or updated annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	N/A	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.10:	Percentage of community cluster plans that are reviewed and updated annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.11:	Percentage of key assets and critical infrastructure that are updated for hazard potential annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	187.5	90	129.17	-
Measure 1.12:	Percentage of weekly tiered and multi-form tests of the internal notification system completed annually, with reports on agencies' compliance submitted to the EPC co-chairs quarterly					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	82.69	100	-
Measure 1.13:	Percentage of weekly unannounced tests of the emergency alert system completed annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	95.83	82.69	2100	-

**Program 2: Incident and Event Management**

*Manager(s):* Kerry Payne, Deputy Operations Chief; Joshua Jack, Change Management Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Darrell L. Darnell, Director

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the Incident and Event Management Program exceeded expectations.

Measure 2.1:	Percentage of street closure applications processed within 15 business days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	100	100	100
	Actual	100	105.26	100	100	-

Measure 2.2: Percentage of tenants displaced by the District Government that are housed in a safe environment within 24 hours

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	105.26	NA	100	-

Note: There were no events (fires and/or other emergencies) that resulted in the District Government displacing tenants during FY 2004 or FY 2006.

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Darrell L. Darnell, Director

**Program Results:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2: Cost of Risk

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	66.7	58.3	-	-

Measure 3.4: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	100	100	93.3	66.7	-

## ***Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure (DQ0)***

### **Program 1: Judicial Disabilities and Tenure**

*Manager(s):* Cathaee Hudgins, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* William P. Lightfoot, Chairperson

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure exceeded expectations for its Judicial Disabilities and Tenure Program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of judicial misconduct complaints disposed of	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	86.67	81.6	93.94	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of judicial misconduct investigations completed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	75	68.4	91.67	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.3:	Percent of judicial reappointment evaluations completed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of fitness reviews for senior judges completed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	83.33	100	100	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Cathaee Hudgins, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* William P. Lightfoot, Chairperson

### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	25	50	50	-

## ***Judicial Nomination Commission (DV0)***

### **Program 1: Judicial Nomination**

*Supervisor(s):* Peggy Williams Smith, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The Judicial Nomination Commission met targets for the two Key Result Measures in Judicial Nomination program and thus exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of candidate panels for judicial vacancies presented within 60 days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of required background investigations conducted and completed on judicial vacancy applicants	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Note: Per agency request, the wordings of this KRM is changed from "Percent of background investigations conducted and completed on judicial vacancy applicants" (1/3/07).

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Peggy Williams Smith, Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	67	100	-

## ***Office of Police Complaints (FH0)***

### **Program 1: Complaint Resolution**

*Manager(s):* Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC exceeded expectations for the Complaint Resolution Program by significantly surpassing the target for one and nearly meeting the target for the other of this program's two measures.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of investigations completed and reports produced in six months					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	50	50	60	65
	Actual	N/A	82.67	68.9	59.68	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of Complaint Examiner decisions issued within 120 days.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
	Actual	N/A	86.67	80	95.45	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2006. Replaces previous KRM 1.2 "Percent of decisions rendered in 90 days". A 90 day timeframe proved unrealistic due to delays beyond the agency's control.					

### **Program 2: Public Relations**

*Manager(s):* Thomas E. Sharp, Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC significantly exceeded expectations by meeting its target for the Public Relations Program's single measure. The result is expressed as a number of activities rather than a percentage.

Measure 2.1:	Number of outreach activities attended or sponsored by OPC					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	18	18	18	18
	Actual	N/A	18	27	25	-

### **Program 3: Policy Recommendation**

*Manager(s):* Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC exceeded expectations by meeting its target for the single measure of the Policy Recommendation Program. The result is expressed as the number of policy recommendations issued rather than a percentage.

Measure 3.1:	Actual number of policy recommendations issued					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	4	4	4	4
	Actual	N/A	4	4	4	-

**Program 4: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Philip K. Eure, Director; Thomas E. Sharp*Supervisor(s):* Philip K. Eure, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	N/A
	Actual	N/A	26.1	55	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	N/A	60	60	75	-

## ***DC Sentencing Commission (FZ0)***

### **Program 1: Data Collection, Analyses and Implementation**

*Manager(s):* Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

The District of Columbia Sentencing Commission met expectations for the Data Collection, Analyses and Implementation Program. Targets for four of the program's eight Key Result Measures were met or exceeded, although the remaining four KRMs fell far short of their targets.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of DCSC data downloaded	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	23.1	0	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of Compliance Reached	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	65	70	70	80
	Actual	N/A	88.46	86.9	87.34	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of departures with explanations entered into the database	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	95	80	80	80
	Actual	N/A	22.17	8.3	9.09	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of judges who report a favorable rating	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	60	70	70	75
	Actual	N/A	100	100	0	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent of resource impact estimates prepared for all proposed guidelines changes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: During FY 2005 and 2006 there were no proposed guideline changes requiring resource impact statements.					
Measure 1.6:	Percent of practitioners attending training that request training	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	-	100	-
	Note: There were no training requests during FY 2006.					
Measure 1.7:	Percent of guidelines questions answered within 24 hours	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	95	99	99	99
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.8: Percent of judges and other registered practitioners who request a guidelines manual that receive one

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	30.4	-	-	-

Measure 2.3: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	75	66.7	43	-

## Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (FX0)

### Program 1: Death Investigation and Certification

*Manager(s):* Fiona Couper, PhD; Michelle Mack; Terencia Davenport; Beverly Fields

*Supervisor(s):* Marie-Lydie Pierre-Louis, MD, Chief Medical Examiner

### Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

DC OCME exceeded expectations and significantly exceeded expectations for its two programs, Death Investigation and Certification and Fatality Review respectively. The Programs include twelve KRMs, in which nine are associated with Death Investigations and three are associated with Fatality Review. Three of these measures show need for improvement. However, the remaining nine targets were met, exceeded or significantly exceeded, but no rating is provided for its third program, Agency Management for FY 2007.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of positively identified bodies ready for release within 48 hours					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	60	75.81	79.2	93.52	-
	Note: Time changed from 24 to 48 hours for FY 2007 at agency request. FY 2006 and earlier data refer to 24 hour timeframe. (1/30/2007)					
Measure 1.2:	Percent of bodies examined to completion within two calendar days of intake at OCME					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	98	99.56	99.1	99.64	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of primary contacts (case decision for jurisdiction) made within eight hours of case assignment to investigator					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	80	85	85	85
	Actual	89	92.01	90.5	91.86	-
	Note: This measure records the amount of time it takes for OCME to determine whether the agency needs to investigate a case pursuant to its duties after a medico-legal investigator has been notified about a death.					
Measure 1.4:	Percent of mortuary scene response within one hour of notification that case has been accepted for OCME jurisdiction by an investigator or medical examiner					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	80	80	80
	Actual	81	81.98	75.1	86.82	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent of medicolegal investigator scene response within two hours of OCME notification					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	90	95	85	95
	Actual	97	97.2	98.3	97	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of negative toxicology examinations completed within 30 days of case submission

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	91	96.93	96.7	97.39	-

Measure 1.7: Percent of positive toxicology examinations completed within 60 days of case submission

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	95	95	95	95
Actual	88	94.98	95.4	98.02	-

Measure 1.8: Percent of autopsy reports on homicide cases completed within 60 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	70	80	80	80
Actual	47	71.57	85.3	70.29	-

Note: This Measure was previously known as Measure 1.11

Measure 1.9: Percent of autopsy reports on non-homicide cases completed within 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	50	70	80	80	80
Actual	34	59.32	70.3	71.03	-

Note: This Measure was previously known as Measure 1.12

**Program 2: Fatality Review**

*Manager(s):* Mary Campbell; Gwendolyn Bellfield; Sharan James

*Supervisor(s):* Sharan James

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 2.1: Percent of CFRC fatality reviews held within six months of notification of the death

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	65	75	85	85	85
Actual	74	79.92	88.4	90.82	-

Note: Replaces Measures 1.8.

Measure 2.2: Percent of CFRC fatality review recommendations issued quarterly and within six months of holding the review.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	85	95	95	N/A
Actual	100	72.92	100	100	-

Note: Replaces Measures 1.9. Timeframe erroneously published as three months in FY 2007 budget. Wording changed at agency request (01/08)

Measure 2.3	Percent of MRDD fatality reviews held within three months of receipt of the investigative report from DDS (formerly MRDDA).				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Note: Replaces Measure 1.10: Percent of MRDD fatality reviews held within six months of notification of the death. FY 2007 and beyond targets reduced to 85% from 90% at agency request. (12/18/2006) Measure wording revised at agency request. (2/2007)					

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Beverly Fields; Peggy Fogg

*Supervisor(s):* Marie-Lydie Pierre-Louis, MD, Chief Medical Examiner

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	40.9	82.4	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	75	64.3	76.9	75	-

## ***Office of Administrative Hearings (FS0)***

### **Program 1: Judicial**

*Manager(s):* Mark P. Poindexter, Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge

*Supervisor(s):* Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded the two targets for the Judicial program's performance measures.

Measure 1.1: Percentage of case dispositions within 120 days of filing

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	90.5	98.42	-

Note: Previously "Percentage of case dispositions within 90 days of record closure" (2/07). Only Unemployment Cases are included.

Measure 1.2: Percentage of Administrative Law Judges who have completed mediation/alternative dispute resolution training

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	75
Actual	N/A	N/A	42.4	90.91	-

Note: FY 2007 and 2008 targets adjusted to 75% at agency request. (2/07)

### **Program 2: Executive**

*Manager(s):* Michael Williams, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded its one target for the Executive program's single measure.

Measure 2.1: Percent of consumer satisfaction surveys with a rating of "Met My Expectations" or better

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	75	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.15	-

Note: Replaces "Percentage of consumer satisfaction survey results posted quarterly on OAH's website." (2/07)

### **Program 3: Clerk of the Court**

*Manager(s):* Darrell Donnelly, Supervisory Clerk of the Court

*Supervisor(s):* Michael Williams, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 3.1: Percent of initial case files setup in the case management data system within 7 days of receipt

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	82.38	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of cases scheduled for a hearing within 7 days of initial case file setup

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	53	-

**Program 4: Court Counsel**

*Manager(s):* Lisa Coleman, General Counsel

*Supervisor(s):* Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded their target for the Court Counsel program by 325%.

Measure 4.1: Number of outreach sessions provided to familiarize citizens, members of the bar and agencies with OAH and its processes

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	6	6	8	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	27	26	-

**Program 5: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Michael Williams, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):* Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.3: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	75	100	-

## ***Corrections Information Council (FI0)***

### **Program 1: Prisoner Well-Being**

*Manager(s):* Vanya Brown, Secretary

*Supervisor(s):* Vanya Brown, Secretary

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Corrections Information Council (FI0) does not provide any targets for its Key Results Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of inspections conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of staff and prisoner interviews conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of conditions that are corrected from initial inspection	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of public forums conducted	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Vanya Brown, Secretary

*Supervisor(s):* Vanya Brown, Secretary

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Corrections Information Council (FI0) does not provide any targets for its Key Results Measures (KRMs). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 2.1:	Dollars saved by agency-based labor management partnership project(s)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.4:	Rating of 4-5 on all four telephone service quality criteria: 1) Courtesy, 2) Knowledge, 3) Etiquette and 4) Overall Impression	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.5:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

## ***Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (FJ0)***

### **Program 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation**

*Manager(s):* Nancy Ware, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Ware, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council significantly exceeded expectations by achieving 100%, rather than the targeted 70%, for the Research, Analysis and Evaluation Program's single Key Result Measure.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of research reports created on critical issues identified by member agencies	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	50	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

### **Program 2: Collaboration and Planning Across Justice Agencies**

*Manager(s):* Nancy Ware, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Ware, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

CJCC again significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing the target for this program's single KRM.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of priority committees organized to oversee CJCC's work	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	80
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

### **Program 3: Integrated Information Sharing Across Agencies**

*Manager(s):* Richard Catalon, Information Technology Specialist

*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Ware, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

Although CJCC met expectations for one of the KRMs in this program, CJCC failed to meet the target for the measure regarding percentage of IT staff hired. This is because the positions have not been released for hiring. CJCC is still investigating. Consequently the staffing is still contractual.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of IT staff hired (see explanation above)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	50	50	50	75
	Actual	N/A	N/A	60	0	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of agencies using the technology information sharing system	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	60	80	80	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	78.13	-

**Program 4: Agency Management***Supervisor(s):* Nancy Ware, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	50	-

## Office of Unified Communications (UC0)

### Program 1: Emergency/Non-Emergency Operations (911/311)

Manager(s): Kenneth Mallory

Supervisor(s): Janice Quintana, Director

### Program Result: Met Expectations

The Office of Unified Communications met expectations for the Emergency/Non-Emergency Operations (911/311) Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of 911 calls answered within 5 seconds

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	94.1	96	95.5	-

Measure 1.2: Percent change in the number of 911 calls answered in 6 seconds or more

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	-1	-2	-2	-2
Actual	N/A	-56.4	-10.5	-20.8	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of 311 calls answered within 10 seconds

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	95	96.6	94	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of 911 calls (wireline and wireless) abandoned

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	6	5	4	4
Actual	N/A	2.8	2.98	2.7	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of all calls for Fire/EMS operations and Priority One Police operations received by call-takers, processed and sent to the radio dispatcher within 60 seconds or less (call to queue)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	50	60	60
Actual	N/A	N/A	34.1	42.1	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.6: Percent of Priority One calls for police operations, received by dispatchers and dispatched to a responding unit within 60 seconds or less (queue to dispatch)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	50	70	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	49	82.3	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 (5/11/06).

Measure 1.7: Percent of all calls for Fire/EMS operations, received by dispatchers and dispatched to a responding unit within 60 seconds or less (queue to dispatch)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	95	97.5	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	78.1	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Originally addressed Priority One calls only. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.8:	Percent of current call-takers trained and active as Universal Call Takers (UCTs)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	20	40	60	70
	Actual	N/A	17.2	40	40	-
Measure 1.9:	Percent of functioning Automated Vehicle Locators (AVLs) for EMS transport and rapid units	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	80	90	90	95
	Actual	N/A	91.1	100	95.6	-
Measure 1.10:	Percent of emergency calls dispatched to the accurate location	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99.99	-
Measure 1.11:	Percent of current call-takers that are conversationally bi-lingual	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	10	12	15
	Actual	N/A	9	12	10	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 8% to 10% due to FY 2005 results exceeding original FY 2006 target (3/10/06).					
Measure 1.12:	Percent of time Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system is operational	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	99	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
Measure 1.13:	Percent of time Land Mobile Radio - Fire (LMR-F) system is operational	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	99	100	99	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99	-
Measure 1.14:	Percent of time Land Mobile Radio - Police (LMR-P) system is operational	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	99	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99	-
Measure 1.15:	Percent of equipment on 911/311 replacement schedule that has been replaced	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. FY 2007 will be used as a baseline to validate FY 2008 target (5/11/06).					
Measure 1.16:	Percent of required policies, procedures and business processes that are compliant with CALEA standards	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets are to achieve 100% compliance in FY 2007 and					

CALEA accreditation in FY 2008. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.17:	Percent of calls to the Mayor's Citywide Call Center that are abandoned				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007 (5/11/06)					

Measure 1.18:	Percent of calls to the Mayor's Citywide Call Center that are answered by a live operator before reaching the queue (Calls Without Queue)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007 (5/11/06)					

**Program 2: Mayor's Call Center**  
*Supervisor(s):* Janice Quintana, Director

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*  
 Overall, OUC met expectations in the Mayor's Call Center.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of callers to District call centers that reach an operator within 2.5 minutes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	95	95	95
Actual	N/A	95	97	99.29	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of District's main operators that provide customer service that is rated as good or excellent in courtesy, knowledge, etiquette and overall impression				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	100	97.3	96.2	-
Note: FY 2006 target increased from 95% to 97.5% based on FY 2005 results. (3/10/06)					

Measure 2.3:	Percent of constituent issues entered into IQ and responded to within two weeks				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.4:	Number of complaints to OUC per 1000 calls received (911 and 311)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	0.06	6	0.06
Actual	N/A	N/A	0.15	3	-

**Program 3: Agency Management**  
*Manager(s):* Chris Omekam  
*Supervisor(s):* Janice Quintana, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*  
 No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	60	47	-	-
Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	86.7	84.2	50	-



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter D: Public Education System**

**March 2008**

---

## ***District of Columbia Public Schools (GA0)***

### **Program 1: Schools and School Transformation**

**Manager(s):** Tracy Higgins, Chief of Schools

**Supervisor(s):** Michelle Rhee, Chancellor

### **Program Result: Does Not Meet Expectations**

The District of Columbia Public Schools (GA0) did not meet the targets for the three KRMs applicable for FY 2007.

Measure 1.1: Percent of schools showing increases in average DC CAS scores across all grades in reading.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	54	59	65
Actual	46	49	36	45	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of schools showing increases in average DC CAS scores across all grades in math.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	57	59	69	69
Actual	56	56	26	57	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of students (Secondary) scoring proficient or above for English Language Arts

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	37	43	50	57
Actual	31	29	29	-	-

Note: At agency request, the earlier KRM "Percent of students successfully completing algebra by end of the eighth grade" is replaced with this new KRM. FY 2006 represents the first year of testing results from the new DC-CAS assessment tool which is more rigorous than the previously used assessment. It can be expected that there would be a decline in test scores in the first few years of implementation of any new assessment (2/15/07).

Measure 1.4: Percent of students (Secondary) scoring proficient or above in Mathematics

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	42	47	53	60
Actual	37	31	23	-	-

Note: At agency request, the earlier KRM "Percent of schools achieving SETS Platinum Standard" is replaced with this new KRM. FY 2006 represents the first year of testing results from the new DC-CAS assessment tool which is more rigorous than the previously used assessment. It can be expected that there would be a decline in test scores in the first few years of implementation of any new assessment (2/15/07).

Measure 1.5: Percentage of 9th-grade students who graduate four years later

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	73	76	79	82
Actual	70	69.6	66.2	-	-

Note: At agency request, the earlier KRM "Percent of original T-9 schools with a substantial increase in SAT-9 scores across all grades in reading and math" is replaced with this new KRM (2/15/07).

Measure 1.6:	Percent of schools with 40% or more of students at proficient or above on DC CAS.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	92.6	93.3	94	94.7
	Actual	91.9	91.7	92.2	31	-

Measure 1.7:	Percent of students with at least 15 unexcused absences					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	21	18.5	16	13.5
	Actual	23.5	21.4	16.6	-	-
	Note: At agency request, the earlier KRM "Number of No Child Left Behind sending schools" is replaced with this new KRM (2/15/07).					

Measure 1.8:	Percent of students who drop out each year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	6.7	6.5	6.4	6.2
	Actual	6.9	7.6	6	-	-
	Note: At agency request, this new KRM is added (2/15/07).					

**Program 2: Curricula, Instruction, and Academic Services**

*Manager(s):* Sherry Ulery, Chief of Teaching and Learning

*Supervisor(s):* Michelle Rhee, Chancellor

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Out of two KRMs reported for FY 2007, the Public District of Columbia Public Schools (GA0) exceeded the target of one KRM and fell below the target of one KRM. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of students and teachers in receipt of textbooks aligned with DCPS curriculum and standards					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	93	100	100	-	-

Measure 2.2:	The number of students participating in AP programs					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	2356	2428	2572
	Actual	2284	N/A	2314	-	-
	Note: The KRM wording is changed from "Percent of schools with Gifted and Talented or AP course program", per agency request (2/15/07).					

Measure 2.3:	Increase the number of students scoring 3 or better of the AP exam					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	602	722
	Actual	531	549	547	-	-
	Note: The KRM wording is changed from "Percent of AYP increase in reading as required by 'No Child Left Behind' legislation", per agency request (2/15/07).					

Measure 2.4:	Number of twelfth graders taking the SAT					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	2500	2500	N/A	1480	1495
	Actual	1542	1499	1467	1534	-

Measure 2.5:	Percent of tenth graders taking the PSAT					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	N/A	N/A	64	66
	Actual	51	77	63.1	60	-

**Program 3: Direct Student Services**

*Manager(s):* Diane Powell, Assistant Superintendent, David Goodman, Director of Food Services

*Supervisor(s):* Tracy Martin, Chief of Schools; Abdusalam Omer, Chief of Business Operations

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

District of Columbia Public Schools (GA0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of students with up-to-date immunization records on file at the opening of the school year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	94	96	98	-	-
	Note: Words "at the opening of the school year" is added at the end of the previous KRM name, per agency request (2/15/07).					

Measure 3.2:	The number of truant students served in the two attendance intervention centers annually					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	1000	3000	3000	3000	3000
	Actual	1460	3964	3114	-	-
	Note: This measure has replaced the earlier measure "Percent of buses, drivers and attendants available for service at start-up each day", per agency request (2/15/07).					

Measure 3.3:	Total student scholarship dollars awarded (in millions)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	25	15	16	N/A	N/A
	Actual	26	18	16	17	-
	Note: The amount of scholarship dollars awarded is reliant on the number of scholarships made available by individuals, organizations and/or government agencies and the number of qualified applicants. The amount of dollars cannot be forecasted in advance (2/15/07).					

Measure 3.4:	Percent of students in senior high schools who have received instruction in school about AIDS or HIV infection					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	90.5	N/A	90	90
	Actual	N/A	90.5	-	-	-
	Note: This measure has replaced the earlier measure "Percent of students in grades 7-12 receiving HIV/AIDS education", per agency request (2/15/07).					

Measure 3.5:	Percent of students in middle schools who have received instruction in school about AIDS or HIV infection				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90.5	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	90.5	-	-	-
Note: This measure is added per agency request (2/15/07).					
Measure 3.6:	Percent of homeless children and youth served				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	-	-
Note: This measure is added per agency request. The Actual data represent 100% of 782, 2612 and 2549 identified homeless children attending DC Public Schools during FY 2004, 2005 and 2006, respectively (2/15/07).					
Measure 3.7:	Percent of students receiving Visiting Instruction Services				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	-	-
Note: This measure is added per agency request. The Actual data represent 100% of 123, 96 and 53 students during FY 2004, 2005 and 2006, respectively (2/15/07).					
Measure 3.8:	Percent of students receiving school breakfast each day				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	30	30	30	33	35
Actual	23	25	29	-	-
Measure 3.9:	Percent of students receiving school lunch each day				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	65	65	66
Actual	61	63	63	-	-

## ***Office of the State Superintendent of Education (GD0)***

### **Program 1: Nutrition Services**

*Manager(s):* Cynthia Bell, Director, Nutrition Services

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Overall, the agency met expectations in the Nutrition Services program. The decrease in the National School Lunch Program performance is the result of refining the method used to calculate actuals.

The DC Free Summer Meals Program scored lower than its very ambitious target, but showed improvement over FY 2006, feeding 29,158 children, and remains one of the nations finest.

Measure 1.1: Percent of free and reduced eligible children participating in the District of Columbia National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	80	80	82
Actual	N/A	85.11	77.45	61.08	-

Note: "Free and reduced" added to clarify eligible population.

Measure 1.2: Percent of licensed child care centers and family day care homes in the District of Columbia participating in the Child Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	60	65	50	55
Actual	N/A	47.74	47.24	61.65	-

Note: FY 2007 target reduced from 70% to 50% at agency request. (12/2006)

Measure 1.3: Percent of children participating in the DC Free Summer Meals Program

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	80	100	80	85
Actual	78	66.25	68.69	69.42	-

Note: FY2007 target incorrectly entered as 95% in 2007 budget.

### **Program 2: Higher Education Financial Services**

*Manager(s):* John B. Parham II, Director HEFS

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the agency significantly exceeded expectations in the Higher Education Financial Services program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of DC OneApp applicants enrolled at postsecondary institutions

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	-	-	65	70
Actual	-	-	-	88.49	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of public high school counselors receiving specialized training to support their facilitation of high school graduates correctly completing applications for HEFS programs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	50	70	75	75
Actual	-	100	-	80.79	-

Measure 2.3: Percent of incoming applications receiving eligibility determinations within 20 business days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	90	87	90
Actual	100	74.68	87.62	99.84	-

Note: FY2007 target incorrectly reported as 95% in 2007 budget. Measure name revised for clarity. (2/5/2007)

**Program 3: Policy, Research and Analysis**

*Manager(s):* Glenda Partee, Director; Policy, Research and Analysis

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Policy, Research and Analysis set a higher goal for Ed Digest's target audience. This more ambitious goal was exceeded, although not by the same percentage as in past years, giving the inaccurate impression of a decrease in performance for Measure 3.2.

Measure 3.1: Percent of PRA convening attendees/participants who rated the experience 4 or better on the value assessment survey

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	85	90	95	100
Actual	-	83.87	87.67	68.0	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of target audience that subscribes to the OSSE Ed Digest

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	90	95	90	100
Actual	-	129.35	138.27	118.93	-

Note: The OSSE Ed Digest is OSSE's monthly electronic information sharing resource FY 2007 target incorrectly reported as 95% in 2007 budget.

**Program 4: Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support**

*Manager(s):* Stefan Huh, Director; Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 4.1: Percent of dollars allocated to the charter schools through the Credit Enhancement and Direct Loan Fund

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	100	90	100	100
Actual	-	142.7	100	100	-

Measure 4.2: Percent growth of schools that are in the total loan portfolio through the Credit Enhancement and Direct Loan Fund

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	21	26	12	25
Actual	-	26.32	20.83	13.79	-

Note: FY 2007 target decreased from 20% to 12% to reflect sustainable growth. (1/10/2007)

**Program 5: Educational Licensure**

*Manager(s):* Eurmon Hervey, Director; Educational Programs

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 5.1: Percent of site evaluations conducted

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	85	85	95	100
Actual	90	100	100	100	-

Measure 5.2: Percent of transcript requests fulfilled within 45 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	-	95	95	100
Actual	-	-	90.57	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Replaces "Percent of student complaints resolved within 90 days." (3/11/06)

Measure 5.3: Percent of renewal applications reviewed for compliance

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	-	90	95	95	-
Actual	-	100	125.49	121.43	-

Note: Replaces original measure, "Percent of new and renewal applications reviewed for compliance." The agency cannot accurately project new applications but can reliably project and measure renewals. (3/11/06)

**Program 6: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Joanne Smoak, Director of Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Deborah Gist, State Education Officer

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 6.1: Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	42	54.2	-	-

Measure 6.2: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	87.5	66.7	76.9	76.9	-

## ***District of Columbia Public Library (CE0)***

### **Program 1: Lifetime of Learning**

*Manager(s):* Ginnie Cooper, Chief Librarian

*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Davenport, Interim Director of Library Services

### **Program Result: Met Expectations**

Overall, DC Public Library met expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of public, private and charter elementary schools and licensed child care homes that expose children to reading opportunities through visits to and/or from the library

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	50	50	60
Actual	N/A	48.61	60.44	77.58	-

Note: New measure added in FY 2005. FY 2006 and FY 2007 target increased from 4.0 and 4.5, respectively to 50 percent at agency request (2/06).

Measure 1.2: Percent of children in the District between birth and 19 exposed to reading opportunities through enrollment in the Summer Quest reading program

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	15	15	15	25
Actual	N/A	14.58	44.32	90.08	-

Measure 1.3: Percent change in the number of adults that participate in library activities and rate the adult services satisfactory or better in addressing their literacy needs and improve their reading skills

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	10	10	10
Actual	N/A	2.5	11.66	85.48	-

Note: New measure added in FY 2005. Per agency request, "and rate the adult services satisfactory or better in addressing" is inserted replacing "to address" in the KRM name (12/27/06).

Measure 1.4: Percent change in number of visits per service hour

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	3	10	10
Actual	N/A	-8.8	14.19	4.93	-

Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004). FY 2007 target increased from 4 to 10 percent at agency request. (2/2006)

Measure 1.5: Percent change in the number of Adult Literacy Providers rating the services provided by ALS as satisfactory or better

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	135	75	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets TBD. (2/2006)

**Program 2: Library Materials and Their Use***Manager(s):* Ginnie Cooper, Chief Librarian*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Davenport, Interim Director of Library Services**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The DC Public Library significantly exceeded the one measure it reported for the Library Materials and Their Use Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of library reference requesters reporting at the time of their visit that they received the information they needed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	72	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: No FY 2005 data was collected due to personnel retirement. (2/2006) FY 2008 target is 10%.

Measure 2.2: Customers will find print and audio visual materials they want and need as an indicator reflected through a percent change in annual circulation per capita

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	0.25	2	10	10
Actual	N/A	-0.8	13.2	22.74	-

Note: FY 2007 target increased from 3 to 10 percent at agency request (2/2006). Per agency request, "Customers will find print and audio visual materials they want and need as an indicator reflected through a" is inserted in front of the previous KRM name (12/27/06).

Measure 2.3: Percent of eLibrary Service requests answered satisfactorily

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	85	85	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	92.75	-	-

Note: Formerly "Percent of customers who successfully receive answers to information requests submitted by phone or via the internet." FY 2007 target decreased from 89 to 85 percent at agency request. (2/2006)

**Program 3: Removing Barriers to Access***Manager(s):* Ginnie Cooper, Chief Librarian*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Davenport, Interim Director of Library Services**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The DC Public Library significantly exceeded two targets but did not meet one target for the three Key Result Measures of the Removing Barriers to Access Program. Overall, the agency has exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 3.1: Percent change in utilization rate for public access computers

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	10	10
Actual	N/A	-3.35	52.96	49.48	-

Note: FY 2007 target increased from 5 to 10 percent at agency request. (2/2006)

Measure 3.2:	Percent change in number of customers attending free computer user training to be measured by a structured customer survey				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	10	10
Actual	N/A	-0.1	-10.11	74.69	-
Note: FY 2007 target increased from 5 to 10 percent at agency request (2/2006). Per agency request, "to be measured by a structured customer survey" is inserted at the end of previous KRM name (12/27/06).					

Measure 3.3:	Percent change in number of DC residents with limited ability to physically access the library and its materials who through one of the services in the Adaptive Services Activity use library materials/services in an accessible format and/or location				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	10	N/A
Actual	N/A	79.3	408.21	-14.94	-
Note: FY 2007 target increased from 5 to 10 percent at agency request. (2/2006)					

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Ginnie Cooper, Chief Librarian

*Supervisor(s):* Bridget Bradley, Executive Officer

**Program Result: No Rating**

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	41	25	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	44	73	75	-



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter E: Human Support Services**

**March 2008**

---

## ***Department of Human Services (JA0)***

### **Program 1: Early Care and Education**

*Manager(s):* Barbara Kamara, Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence H. Carter, Director

### **Program Result: Exceeded Expectations**

The Department of Human Services exceeded expectations for the Early Care and Education Administration Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of eligible children served by the ECEA placed in subsidized child care facilities

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	40	40	65	65	70
Actual	44	47.79	73.5	66.01	-

Note: FY 2006 target is increased from 40% to 65% per agency request. (2/2006) Program name changed OECD to ECEA. (3/2007)

Measure 1.2: Percent of licensed provider sites with national accreditation

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	23	23	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	30.3	37.19	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006. Revised from "Percent of teachers with Child Development Associates (CDA) credentials." FY 2006-07 targets reduced from 40% to 23%. (3/11/06)

Measure 1.3: Percent of children receiving early intervention services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	93	93
Actual	N/A	N/A	92.6	92.07	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 1.4: Percent of eligibility re-determinations finalized by ECEA within the 12-month requirement

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	95.23	-

Note: Replaces "Percent of eligibility re-determinations finalized by OECD within 30 days" (3/2006) Program name changed OECD to ECEA. (3/2007)

Measure 1.5: Percent of ECEA open cases with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP) completed with needs appropriately identified

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target 90	90	90	93	85	
Actual 99	96.03	77.9	75.74	-	

Note: Program name changed OECD to ECEA. (3/2007)

**Program 2: Family Services***Manager(s):* Fred Swan, Administrator*Supervisor(s):* Clarence H. Carter, Director**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DHS exceeded expectations for the Family Services Administration Program. Targets for seven of the eight of this Program's KRMs were met or surpassed.

Measure 2.1: Percent of APS cases investigated

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 2.2: Percent of the clients enrolled in Housing Assistance Case Management service that obtain improved housing

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	17.95	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007. Consolidates previous KRMs 2.2 "Percent of homeless individuals identified by DHS/Family Services Administration who obtain stable transitional housing" and 2.4 "Percent of homeless families identified by DHS/Family Services Administration who obtain transitional housing." (3/11/06)

Measure 2.3: Percent of refugees served by the Family Services Administration who obtain and retain employment for 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	N/A
Actual	88	93.6	87.8	86.67	-

Measure 2.4: Percent of teens in the Teen Parent Assessment Program (TPA) receiving pregnancy prevention services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	133.52	179.7	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 2.5: Percent of cases with a completed or preliminary assessment made in 7 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target N/A	N/A	80	82	N/A	N/A
Actual N/A	N/A	86.95	97.57	-	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 2.6: Percent of cases with a comprehensive assessment for families with moderate to serious risk factors completed within 45 days.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	82	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	92.73	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 2.7:	Percent of cases with a follow-up case plan completed within 180 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	82	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	100.0	100.0	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006.					

Measure 2.8:	Percent of cases closed with self-improvement goals and stabilized				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	50	52	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	76.39	100.0	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006.					

**Program 3: Income Maintenance**

*Manager(s):* Sharon Cooper-DeLoatch, Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence H. Carter, Director

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DHS exceeded expectations for this Program. Targets for four of Income Maintenance's five KRMs were slightly surpassed.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of TANF eligibility determinations finalized within 45 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	98	98	N/A
Actual	N/A	97.98	98.6	96.82	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. The KRM is re-named from "Percent of TANF eligibility determinations finalized within 30 days", per agency request (2/22/06).					

Measure 3.2:	Percent of food stamp eligibility determinations finalized within 30 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	98	98	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	99.4	98.86	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006.					

Measure 3.3:	Percent of Medicaid eligibility determinations finalized within 90 days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	98	98	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	99.2	99.02	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006.					

Measure 3.4:	Percent of TANF Employment Program participants obtaining employment				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	60
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	50.72	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007.					

Measure 3.5:	Percent of Individual Plans for Employment (IPE) completed with service needs appropriately identified				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	99	99	99	99	100
Actual	99	99.25	99.9	100	-
Note: The KRM name is revised from "Percent of individual case plans completed where service needs appropriately identified", per agency request (2/22/06).					

**Program 5: Rehabilitation Services***Manager(s):* Ted Daniels, Acting Administrator*Supervisor(s):* Kate Jesberg, Interim Director**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall DHS exceeded expectations for the Rehabilitation Services Administration Program. As of May 2007, the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is no longer part of DHS. It is now part of the Department on Disability Services.

Measure 5.1: Percent of disability determinations completed within 120 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	114.36	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007.

Measure 5.2: Percent of vocational rehabilitation eligibility determinations completed within 60 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	91	91
Actual	N/A	N/A	86.7	81.96	-

Note: Replaces KRM 5.5: "Percent of eligible determinations finalized within 60 days of application." (3/11/06)

Measure 5.3: Percent of RSA qualified individuals placed in employment who remain employed for 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	72	72
Actual	72	73.82	74	78.27	-

Note: Formerly KRM 4.2. "Qualified individuals" in the former KRM name is replaced with "RSA qualified individuals." (2/2006) Measure name revised for clarity. (3/2007)

Measure 5.4: Percent of clients referred for job placement services placed into jobs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	50
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	66.27	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. Replaces KRM 5.3: "Percent of Individualized Plans for Employment (IPE) completed with service needs identified." (3/11/06)

Measure 5.5: Percent of Independent Living Plans developed within 90 days after eligibility is determined

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	74.47	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. For FY 2008 90 days replaces 180 days, measure name revised. (2/7/2007)

**Program 6: Agency Management***Supervisor(s):* Clarence H. Carter, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 6.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 6.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 6.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	61.3	-	-	-
Measure 6.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	91.67	75	83.3	73.9	-

## ***Department on Disability Services (JM0)***

### **Program 1: Rehabilitation Services**

*Manager(s):* Ted Daniels, Acting Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Kate Jesberg, Interim Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall DDS exceeded expectations for the Rehabilitation Services Administration Program. As of May 2007, the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is no longer part of DHS. It is now part of the Department on Disability Services.

Measure 1.1: Percent of disability determinations completed within 120 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	114.36	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007.

Measure 1.2: Percent of vocational rehabilitation eligibility determinations completed within 60 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	80	91	91
Actual	N/A	N/A	86.7	81.96	-

Note: Replaces KRM 5.5: "Percent of eligible determinations finalized within 60 days of application." (3/11/06)

Measure 1.3: Percent of RSA qualified individuals placed in employment who remain employed for 90 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	72	72
Actual	72	73.82	74	78.27	-

Note: Measure language changed from "qualified individuals" to "RSA qualified individuals." (2/2006) Measure name revised for clarity. (3/2007)

Measure 1.4: Percent of clients referred for job placement services placed into jobs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	50
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	66.27	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.5: Percent of Independent Living Plans developed within 90 days after eligibility is determined

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	74.47	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. For FY 2008 90 days replaces 180 days, measure name revised. (2/7/2007)

### **Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Kate Jesberg, Interim Director

**Program Result:**      *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because no measures have data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	61.3	-	-	-
Measure 2.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	91.67	75	83.3	-	-

## ***Child and Family Services Agency (RL0)***

### **Program 1: Child Welfare**

*Manager(s):* Audrey Sutton, Deputy Director of Program Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

CFSA exceeded expectations for the Child Welfare Program. While the result of one of this program's measures showed a need for improvement, the results of the additional two of this program's three measures exceeded or significantly exceeded expectations.

Measure 1.1: The average monthly caseload of social workers

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	17	17	17	17	17
Actual	16	13.98	12.9	10.9	-

Measure 1.2: Percentage of investigations in compliance with 30 day investigation requirement

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	75	80	95	95
Actual	43	60.84	61.7	85.5	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of foster care and in-home cases with current case plans

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	85	90	95
Actual	78.3	82.19	86.6	92.5	-

Note: This measure is reported as a percent of all cases, including in-home cases beginning in FY 2005 and the FY 2006 target was reduced to 85% to accommodate for this change. (3/11/06)

### **Program 2: Adoption and Guardianship Subsidy**

*Manager(s):* Audrey Sutton, Deputy Director of Program Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

CFSA met expectations of its single KRM for the Adoption and Guardianship Subsidy Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of children achieving permanency through finalized adoptions, guardianships and reunifications of children having the goal of finalized adoptions, guardianships and reunifications

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	40	45	50	50
Actual	N/A	55.86	49.6	46.7	-

### **Program 3: Out-of-Home Care and Support**

*Manager(s):* Audrey Sutton, Deputy Director of Program Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

CFSA significantly exceeded expectations for the one performance representing the Out-of-Home Care and Support Program.

Measure 3.1:	Percent increase in the number of new foster and kinship homes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	10	5	5
	Actual	N/A	112.5	-25.5	30.3	-

**Program 4: Community Based Services**

*Manager(s):* Audrey Sutton, Deputy Director of Program Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

CFSA earned a needs improvement rating for the Community Based Services Program by failing to meet the target for its single KRM.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of families that receive supportive services in their neighborhood upon referral					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	80	85	90	90
	Actual	N/A	97.01	85.4	74.1	-
	Note: New measure in FY 2005. Incorrectly published as "Percent increase in the number of families..." with '07 and '08 targets of 10% in FY 2007 budget book. (6/7/2006)					

**Program 5: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Sharlynn E. Bobo, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	37	41.7	-	-

Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	88.89	71.4	57.1	50	-

## ***Department of Mental Health (RM0)***

### **Program 1: Mental Health Authority (Program and System Development)**

**Manager(s):** Barbara J. Bazron, Ph.D., Deputy Director, Office of Programs & Policy; Shauna Spencer, Associate Deputy Director, Children and Youth (1.1., 1.2 & 1.6); Juanita Y. Reaves, Ph.D., Director, Adult Services (1.3 & 1.4); Steven R. Steury, M.D., Chief Clinical Officer (1.5)

**Supervisor(s):** Stephen T. Baron, Director

### **Program Result: Needs Improvement**

Overall, DMH has improved its performance from FY 2006 in the Program and System Development program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of children receiving mental health services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3	5	5	5	5
Actual	3.9	2.09	1.94	2.67	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.1 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). The target is percentage of D.C. Census data of the number of children. The agency has been and continues to work with the Department of Health (DOH), Medical Assistance Administration (MAA) and the four (4) Medicaid Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) to gather data about the mental health services provided through funding that is not managed by DMH

Measure 1.2: Penetration rate of children with Severe Emotional Disturbance (SED) that receive mental health services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3	3	3	3	3
Actual	3.9	1.45	0.98	1.60	-

Note: The target is percentage of D.C. Census data of the number of children. Per agency request, words "that receive mental health services" are added to the KRM's title (2/15/06). Formerly KRM 2.2 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). The agency has been and continues to work with DOH, MAA and the four (4) (MCOs) to gather data about the mental health services provided through funding that is not managed by DMH (12/28/06).

Measure 1.3: Percent of adults receiving mental health services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3	3	3	3	3
Actual	3.9	2.12	1.63	2.06	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.3 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). The target is percentage of D.C. Census data of the number of adults. The agency has been and continues to work with DOH, MAA and the four (4) (MCOs) to gather data about the mental health services provided through funding that is not managed by DMH (12/28/06).

Measure 1.4: Penetration rate for adults with Severe Mental Illness (SMI) receiving mental health services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3	2	2	2	2
Actual	3.9	1.71	1.39	1.75%	-

Note: The target is percentage of D.C. Census data of the number of adults. Per agency request, words "receiving mental health services" are added to the KRM's title (2/15/06). Formerly KRM 2.4 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). The agency has been and continues to work with DOH, MAA and the four (4) (MCOs) to gather data about the mental health services provided through funding that is not managed by DMH (12/28/06).

Measure 1.5: Percent of adults with schizophrenia receiving new generation antipsychotic medications

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	60.59	82.78	84.92	-

Note: Formerly KRM 5.1 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06).

Measure 1.6: Percent of children with Severe Emotional Disturbance receiving services in a natural setting

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	75	75	75
Actual	N/A	52.59	66.95	65.98	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.13 in FY 2006 budget. The target for FY 2007 is increased from 70 at the request of the agency (3/10/06), so that it coincides with the performance target established under the Dixon exit criteria.

## **Program 2: Community Services Agencies**

*Supervisor(s):* Stephen T. Baron, Director

### **Program Result: Needs Improvement**

Overall, DMH needs improvement for the measures associated with the Community Services Agencies.

Measure 2.1: Percent of persons referred for supported housing within 45 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	58.91	51.16	7.9	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.5 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). In FY 2006, the agency's housing subsidy budget was reduced by one million dollars, adversely impacting its ability to meet the goal of placing mental health consumers who need supported housing in a supported housing program within 45 calendar days of receipt of a completed application (12/28/06). DMH has historically reported only referrals for bridge rental subsidies for this Dixon exit criteria. This represents only one part of the resources allocated for supported housing, which includes the services provided to maintain a consumer in his or her home. It also does not include those consumers who obtain housing services through other District programs or through the work of their community service providers, including Pathways to Housing, a Housing First program funded by DMH. The agency's performance level dropped in FY 2007, because of refinements to the data collection and reporting methods required by the Dixon Court monitor. DMH will be working to enhance its data collection and reporting methods in 2008 to assure compliance with the Dixon exit criteria performance target.

Measure 2.2: Percent of referrals for consumer supported employment service provided within 120 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	85.71	77.47	89	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.6 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). Please note that the agency's ability to meet the target for this measure is affected by annual appropriations for this particular service (12/28/06). The performance target for this KRM was established by Consent Order in the Dixon case.

Measure 2.3: Percent of Severely Mentally Ill (SMI) adults receiving Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) Services within 45 days of referral

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	51.94	56.25

Note: Formerly KRM 2.7 in FY 2006 budget. DMH finalized its data collection and reporting metric for this Dixon exit criteria during FY 2007.

Measure 2.4: Number of homeless and seriously mentally ill adults that are engaged in Housing First programs.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	163.33	213.33	102	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.8 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06). DMH is currently reviewing and expects to revise its data collection methods for this measure (12/28/06). For FY 2007, DMH agreed upon a methodology for reporting data for this measure to the Dixon court monitor. The number reported is the total number of homeless adults with serious mental illness receiving Housing First services from Pathways to Housing. DMH is working with the Court Monitor to expand its reporting with regarding the housing services provided specifically to seriously mentally ill, homeless consumers by providers using a Housing First model.

Measure 2.5: Percent of children with SED receiving services in their own home or a surrogate home setting

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	85	85	85
Actual	64	35.53	93.13	91.43	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.14 in FY 2006 budget (3/10/06).

Measure 2.6: Number of children and adolescents who are homeless that are engaged by a DMH approved provider

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	50	57	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.9 in FY 2006 budget. The agency is currently developing a data collection method for this measure (12/28/06). For FY 2007, DMH gathered data about services provided to homeless children and adolescents through its Homeless Outreach Team.

Measure 2.7: Percent of Children and Adults receiving a community-based, non-emergency service within seven days after discharge from an inpatient psychiatric program.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	80	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	36.38	-

Note: Formerly KRM 2.10 in FY 2006 budget. No data provided for FY 2005 and FY 2006. The measure wording "percent of services" is changed to "percent of Children and Adults receiving services", per agency request (3/13/06). The agency is working with DOH, MAA and the MCOs to ensure that accurate data is available regarding hospital discharge dates to ensure that data reporting for this measure is accurate (12/26/06).

**Program 3: Saint Elizabeth's Hospital**

*Manager(s):* Patrick Canavan, CEO

*Supervisor(s):* Stephen T. Baron, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Department of Mental Health has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Agency note: DMH asked that these performance measures be changed to reflect the measures that were being negotiated with the Department of Justice as part of the settlement of a CRIPA investigation. The District entered into a settlement agreement with the Department of Justice in May 2007, which includes specific performance measures over a three-year.

Measure 3.1: Percent of staff who meet licensure, continuing education, certification and experience requirements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007. DMH will report FY 2006 baseline data (3/10/06).

Measure 3.2: Percent compliance with Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) survey standards on active treatment

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	90	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: Formerly KRM 6.1 in FY 2006 budget. The word "CMS" in the KRM name is replaced with "Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)" and the FY 2007 target is increased from 95, per agency request. No data provided for FY 2005 and 2006 (5/15/06).

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Stephen T. Baron, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	33	46	-	-

Note: The Agency experienced phone system conversion issues that had an impact on the performance of this measure for FY 2006 (12/28/06).

Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	85.71	20	20	70	-

## ***Department of Health (HC0)***

### **Program 1:   Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration**

*Manager(s):*   Tori Whitney, Senior Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

#### **Program Result:**   *Below Expectations*

The Department of Health did not meet the targets for the two key result measures in the Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration. Overall, the agency fell below expectations.

Measure 1.1:   Percent change in substance abuse treatment admissions

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	3	5	5	10
Actual	5697	3	-	-14.46	-

Note: FY 2004 baseline figure of 5,697 is baseline. Calculation requires an unduplicated count. (5/2/06)

Measure 1.2:   Percent increase in number of youth receiving substance abuse treatment

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	10	15	16
Actual	N/A	18	20	10.95	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007, although agency has supplied historic data. FY 2002 baseline of 8,500. (5/2/06)

### **Program 2:   Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Administration**

*Manager(s):*   Beverly Pritchett, Senior Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

#### **Program Result:**   *Met Expectations*

The Department of Health met two targets and didn't meet two targets for the four key result measures in the Emergency Health and Medical Services program. Overall, the agency met expectations.

Measure 2.1:   Percent of basic life support ambulances that pass inspection

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	90	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.2:   Percent of advanced life support ambulances that pass inspection

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	85	90	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.3:   Percent of healthcare providers trained in emergency response

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	75	80	100	100
Actual	N/A	75	36	85.2	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of institutions with updated bio-terrorism plans				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	100	100
Actual	90	N/A	100	92.31	-

**Program 3: HIV/AIDS Administration**

*Manager(s):* Dr. Shannon Hader, Senior Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 3.1:	Percent increase in the number HIV positive individuals identified through counseling and testing (by programs funded through the HIV/AIDS Administration and the CDC)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.5	6
Actual	N/A	N/A	49.7	0.5*	-

Note: HIV/AIDS Administration counseling and testing database and HIV case reporting systems are transitioning to new data collection systems and adjustments in indicators to account for delays in reporting and transition activities may be necessary.

\*Reporting Source is HAA case surveillance database(s).

Measure 3.2:	Percent increase in number of newly diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases as a result of active case findings				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	0.5	0.5	1	N/A
Actual	N/A	-13.1	10.4	-16.8*	-

Note: New measure in FY 2005. HIV/AIDS surveillance numbers for 2007 do not reflect delays in reporting.

\*Reporting Source: HAA case surveillance database(s).

Measure 3.3: Percent increase in number of HIV positive individuals who receive Housing Assistance services (e.g. rental subsidy, purchasing subsidy, multiple families dwelling, etc.) through the HOPWA grant

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	2.5	3	3.5	2.5
	Actual	N/A	2.8	15	21.3*	-

Note: New measure in FY 2005. The FY 2005-2007 targets were erroneously published as 25%, 30% and 35% instead of 2.5%, 3.0% and 3.5% (11/16/05). The increase for FY 2007 is an increase in the services provided and is not an unduplicated count of clients served but rather total housing assistance services provided.

\*Reporting Source: CARE Act data Report (CADR), US DHHS Health Resources and Services Administration.

Measure 3.4:	Percent of HIV tests in non-traditional venues				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	.07*	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. HIV/AIDS Administration counseling and testing database and HIV case reporting systems are transitioning to new data collection systems and adjustments in indicators to account for delays in reporting and transition activities may be necessary.

\* Reporting Source: HAA Routine Screening database

Measure 3.5:	Percent of HIV tests in STD clinic	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	7.12	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

\*Reporting Source: HIV Counseling & Testing System (CTS) and Unique Identifier System (UIS). In November 2006, the District began transitioning from code-based confidential HIV (not AIDS) reporting. Data may contain some duplicates. Total tests equals 41,444.

Measure 3.6:	Percent of HIV tests in TB clinic	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0.07	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

\*Reporting Source: HIV Counseling & Testing System (CTS) and Unique Identifier System (UIS). In November 2006, the District began transitioning from code-based confidential HIV (not AIDS) reporting. Data may contain some duplicates. Total tests equals 41,444.

Measure 3.7:	Percent of HIV test and counseling and referral services to Latino clients	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	6.98	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

\*Reporting Source: HIV Counseling & Testing System (CTS) and Unique Identifier System (UIS). In November 2006, the District began transitioning from code-based confidential HIV (not AIDS) reporting. Data may contain some duplicates. Total tests equals 41,444.

Measure 3.8:	Percent of HIV counseling and testing and referral services (TRS) to inmates	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	33.54	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

\*Reporting Source: HIV Counseling & Testing System (CTS) and Unique Identifier System (UIS). In November 2006, the District began transitioning from code-based confidential HIV (not AIDS) reporting. Data may contain some duplicates. Total tests equals 41,444.

Measure 3.9:	Percent of HIV counseling and testing and referral services to clients defined as high risk groups	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	79.32	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets to be established. Included in this the high risk clients category are those reported the following risk factors: Heterosexual Men, Men who have Sex with other Men (MSM), Intravenous Drug Use (IDU), or MSM/IDU.

\*Reporting Source: HIV Counseling & Testing System (CTS) and Unique Identifier System (UIS). In November 2006, the District began transitioning from code-based confidential HIV (not AIDS) reporting. Data may contain some duplicates. Total tests equals 41,444.

**Program 4: Health Regulation and Licensing Administration***Manager(s):* Dr. Feseha Woldu, Senior Deputy Director*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

Measure 4.1: Number of premises abated for rodent activity

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	3225	3225	3225	3225
Actual	N/A	3417	3388	390	-

Measure 4.2: Percent of facilities licensed within 90 days of license expiration

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	50
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	98.8	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 4.3: Percent of complaints received by Health Regulation responded to within 48 hours

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	60	64.17	-

**Program 5: Medical Assistance Administration***Manager(s):* Robert Maruca, Senior Deputy Director*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 5.1: Percent of targeted population involved in a disease management program to improve health indicators

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	4	2	4	4	4
Actual	9.19	2	3	-	-

Note: Measure formerly appeared as measure 6.2 in FY 2005 March budget. Targets revised to one percent per quarter (four percent annually) at the request of the agency (5/2004).

DOH FY 2005 report indicates target was 2% compared to 4% published in FY 2006 budget.

Measure 5.2: Percent increase on fee-for-service Health Check participation rate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	3	3	3	3	3
Actual	20	1.9	-	-100	-

Note: Measure formerly appeared as measure 6.3 in FY 2005 March budget. Target changed to three percent per year at the request of the agency (5/2004).

Measure 5.3: Percent increase in Health Check participation ratios for managed care plans

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	75	75	75	75
Actual	80	77	-	-100	-

Note: Measure formerly appeared as measure 6.4 in FY 2005 March budget.

Measure 5.4:	Percent change in the number of persons enrolled in the home and community-based elderly and physical disabilities waiver				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	40	40	50	50	10
Actual	N/A	55	54	71.21	-

Measure 5.5:	Percent of individuals diverted from institutional care to home and community based settings as a result of waiver enrollments (elderly and disabled waiver)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	5	7	7	7
Actual	N/A	7.5	4	-	-

**Program 6: Community Health Administration (corresponds to the previous Maternal and Primary Care Administration)**

*Manager(s):* Sandra Robinson, Acting Senior Deputy Director

*Supervisor(s):* Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Measure 6.1:	Percent decrease in the infant mortality rate				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets to be established.

Measure 6.2:	Percent of live births where the women entered prenatal care during the first trimester of pregnancy				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	78	78	78	N/A
Actual	N/A	78	42	77	-

Note: Measure formerly worded, "Percent of case managed women in Wards 5, 6, 7 and 8 who entered prenatal care in the first trimester of pregnancy" (5/10/06)

Measure 6.3:	Percent of students receiving health services through the school nurse program				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	N/A
Actual	N/A	80	66	71.32	-

Measure 6.4:	Percent of WIC and CSFP-eligible residents participating in nutrition intervention and education sessions				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	95	95	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	77.62	-

Measure 6.5:	Percent of children between the ages of six months and six years screened for elevated lead levels				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	1.84	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. Baseline to be established during FY 2007 to set FY 2008 target.

**Program 7: Center for Policy, Planning and Epidemiology**  
**Manager(s):** Dr. John Davies-Cole, Acting Senior Deputy Director  
**Supervisor(s):** Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DOH exceeded expectations for the Policy, Planning and Research Program.

Measure 7.1: Percent of birth and death certificates issued to walk in customers within 30 minutes

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	95
Actual	N/A	90	90	93	-

Note: New measure in FY 2005.

Measure 7.2: Percent of vital record actions completed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.8	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 7.3: Percent of health data requests filled

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	99	99
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 7.4: Percent of health information customers requesting service that are served

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	98	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 7.5: Percent of CON's applications processed

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

**Program 8: Agency Management**  
**Manager(s):** JoEllen Gray, HR Program Service Officer; Tammie Robinson, Agency Fiscal Officer  
**Supervisor(s):** Dr. Carlos Cano, Interim Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Department of Health has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 8.1: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	22.6	28.6	-	-

Measure 8.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	68.75	N/A	71	-	-

Measure 8.3:	Percent increase in the amount of grant funds from federal and private sources					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	5.29	-	-	-
	Note: This measure formerly appeared as KRM 8.6 in the Health Promotion program.					

## ***Department of Parks and Recreation (HA0)***

### **Program 1: Park and Facility Management**

*Manager(s):* Stan Dickson, David Janifer

*Supervisor(s):* John Webster, Acting Associate Director for Parks and Facility Management

#### **Program Result:** *Below Expectations*

The Department of Parks and Recreation was rated below expectations for the Park and Facility Management program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of emergency maintenance requests addressed within 24 hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. Reporting will begin during FY 2007 with implementation of electronic work order management. (12/2006)					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of DPR-owned facilities meeting ADA standards				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	15	28	30
Actual	N/A	24.59	26.3	30	-
Note: FY 2004 is a baseline year. FY 2007 target increased from 17 to 28% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 1.3:	Percent of capital projects completed on time				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	100	100
Actual	80	92.86	100	-	-
Note: The FY 2004 value reflects 19 capital projects completed on-time. FY 2007 target increased from 80 to 100% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of DPR parks rated "clean and safe"				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. Measure employs an electronic tracking system that was not available for implementation until August 2006. Data will be available for FY 2007. (2/2007)					

### **Program 2: Recreational Programs**

*Manager(s):* Victoria Cole-Rolon, Harold Houston, Marcus Ellis

*Supervisor(s):* Sandra Ratliff, Associate Director Programs

#### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DPR's Recreational Programs met expectations during FY 2007.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of TR (therapeutic recreation) customers who report satisfaction with TR programs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	77	90	90
Actual	N/A	84.8	90.9	100	-
Note: New measure FY 2005.					

Measure 2.2:	Percent change in number of senior "health promotion" special events over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	0	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006					

Measure 2.3:	Percent of DPR's 17 child development facilities maintaining national accreditation				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	90	90	100	100
Actual	95	94.1	100	88.24	-
Note: FY 2007 target increased from 90 to 100% at agency request. (3/2006)					

Measure 2.4:	Percent of parents reporting satisfaction with the quality of Daycare/Head Start Programs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	65	70	70	95	95
Actual	97	96.5	90.2	92.61	-
Note: FY 2007 target increased from 70 to 95% at agency request. (3/2006)					

Measure 2.5:	Percent of DPR recreation centers conducting environmental education programming				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	40	60	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	81.8	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006.					

Measure 2.6:	Percent of parents that report satisfaction with their child(ren)'s summer urban day camp experience				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	65	67	88	90
Actual	94.12	85.64	88.4	80.69	-
Note: Previously reported as KRM 3.1. FY 2007 target increased from 68 to 88% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 2.7:	Percent change in number of youth participants in sports leagues				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	5	2	N/A	10	5
Actual	25	N/A	-45.5	244.53	-
Note: FY 2004 and 2005 data cannot be verified or are unavailable. FY 2006 will be the baseline year. FY 2007 target increased from 1% to 10% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 2.8:	Percent of lifeguards needed for summer hired and trained by March 31st				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	60	65	65
Actual	N/A	N/A	29	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006.					

Measure 2.9:	Percent of Roving Leader clients participating in structured prevention programs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	38	40
Actual	N/A	N/A	35	-	-
Note: FY 2006 baseline year for new measure.					

Measure 2.10:	Percent change in registration for programs using RecWare software				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	8500	5	10	10	7
Actual	8555	16.1	173.8	48.71	-
Note: FY 2004 is a baseline year. FY 2005-2006 targets are percent change over the prior fiscal year. Previously reported as KRM 3.8. FY 2006 and 2007 targets increased to 10% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 2.11:	Percent of recreation center visitors participating in structured programs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	30	35
Actual	N/A	N/A	25.6	36.41	-
Note: FY 2006 baseline year for new measure.					

Measure 2.12:	Percent change in number of adult participants in sports leagues				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	2601	597.23	-
Note: FY 2006 baseline year for new measure. Actual is raw number.					

**Program 3: Development and Community Affairs**

*Manager(s):* Melissa McKnight

*Supervisor(s):* Richard Phipps, Chief of Staff

**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

Results for the Development and Community Affairs Program show need of improvement.

Measure 3.1:	Percent change in number of volunteers participating in clean-up and/or other community projects over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	5	10	10	5
Actual	-13	20.49	165.7	-	-
Note: Targets are percent change over the prior fiscal year actual. FY 2006 and FY 2007 targets increased to 10% at agency request (3/2006).					

Measure 3.2:	Percent change in “adopt-a-park” and/or “friends-of groups” over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10	2	N/A	5	10
Actual	21	32.6	28	-	-

Note: FY 2004 and 2005 targets decreased at agency request (11/17/03). Targets are percent change over the prior fiscal year. FY 2004 and 2005 data cannot be verified: FY 2006 will be baseline year: data is reported as a raw number.

Measure 3.3:	Percent change in grant funding over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	5	5	2	2
Actual	82.6	-40.01	-9.3	38.55	-

Note: FY 2005-2006 targets represent a percent change over the prior fiscal year actual. FY 2006 and 2007 targets maintain 27% increase over FY 2003 level. FY 2006 target increased to 5%, FY 2007 target decreased to 2% at agency request (3/2006).

Measure 3.4:	Percent change in corporate sponsorship funding over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	5	5	2	2
Actual	-16.7	41.37	-19	-	-

Note: FY 2006 and 2007 targets maintain 27% increase over FY03 level. In FY 2004 the agency received \$822,475 in funding, falling below the FY 2003 level of \$987,000. FY 2006 target increased from 2 to 5% at agency request. (3/2006)

Measure 3.5:	Percentage of reimbursable meals within the summer food program				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	98	98	100	98	98
Actual	99	100	99.5	96.9	-

Note: FY 2006 target increased from 98 to 100% at agency request. (3/2006)

Measure 3.6:	Percent change in collaborative/cohabitative partnerships with nonprofits over prior year				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	2	2	10	20	15
Actual	40	-41.5	-45.8	142.86	-

Note: FY 2004 value reflects 14 collaborative/cohabitative partnerships with nonprofits over prior year. FY 2006 target increased from 2 to 10%, FY 2007 target increased from 2 to 20% at agency request (3/2006).

#### **Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Aretha Ferrell-Brown

*Supervisor(s):* Clark Ray, Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only two measures have data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the Mayor’s Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	58.3	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	77.27	73	57.9	31.8	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of local budget used for training					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	Actual	0.05	0.07	0.66	0.04	-

## ***DC. Office on Aging (BY0)***

### **Program 1: In-home and Continuing Care**

*Manager(s):* Roxanne Ando, Program and Grants Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence Brown, Ph.D., Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The DC Office on Aging (DCOA) exceeded expectations for the In-home and Continuing Care program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of homemaker and day care participants who remain in their homes for one year or more

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	65	65	65	65
Actual	72	71.48	90.8	61.81	-

Measure 1.2: Percent change in the number of participants enrolled in the Caregiver Institute in the fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	25	25	N/A	N/A	25
Actual	25	84.5	67.2	23.71	-

Note: In FY 2006 the measure was changed from the percentage of participants enrolled for one year to the percentage change in participants enrolled.

Measure 1.3: Percent of persons requesting a nutritious mid-day meal who receive a meal

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	95
Actual	N/A	99.92	99.9	99.93	-

### **Program 2: Community Based Support**

*Manager(s):* Roxanne Ando, Program and Grants Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence Brown, Ph.D., Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC Office on Aging significantly exceeded expectations for the Community Based Support Program. Results for all five of the program's measures significantly surpassed their targets.

Measure 2.1: Percent of Wellness Center participants who increase their awareness and adopt healthy behaviors as indicated by improvements in their overall fitness levels

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	30	35	35	40	45
Actual	61	65.57	86.5	85.25	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of elder rights assistance calls responded to within two days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	75	75	75	80
Actual	92.7	93.95	90.7	87.07	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of resolved complaints in the elder rights assistance activity				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	75	75	75	80
Actual	90	94.12	96.6	88.24	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of community services participants who report that they were able to maintain an active and independent life style				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	75	80	80	85
Actual	78.3	93.68	95.8	97.12	-

Measure 2.5:	Percent of supportive residential facility clients reporting that care received meets their needs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	80	80	80	85
Actual	89.5	100	86.7	95.24	-

**Program 3: Consumer Information, Assistance and Outreach**

*Manager(s):* Bette Reeves, Customer Services/Community Relations Manager

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence Brown, Ph.D., Executive Director

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC Office on Aging significantly exceeded expectations for the Consumer Information, Assistance and Outreach Program. Results for all four of this program's measures significantly surpassed their targets.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of people who seek employment that are placed in jobs				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	35	40	40	40	40
Actual	46	39.85	46.5	52.88	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of persons responding to a survey that were connected to appropriate resources				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	80	85	85	90
Actual	100	100	97.1	92.75	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of survey respondents that respond favorably to an attended special event reporting that they increased their awareness of aging issues, that the social contact was beneficial, and that they had a positive image of aging as a result				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	75	80	83	85	90
Actual	82	95.41	93.6	92.77	-

Measure 3.4:	Percent of training and education survey respondents submitting favorable training evaluations, indicating enhanced knowledge and increased skills about elderly issues				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	60	65	80	90	90
Actual	94	90.38	93.9	97.04	-

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Cynthia Simmons, Chief of Staff; Sam Gawad, Compliance and Administration Manager; Sherlyn Taylor, Program and Grants Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Clarence Brown, Ph.D., Executive Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	96.3	100	-	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	100	100	90	-

## ***Office of Human Rights (HM0)***

### **Program 1: Equal Justice**

**Manager(s):** Alease Parson, EEO Supervisor; Dianne Betz, EEO Supervisor; Georgia Stewart, EEO Supervisor; Barbara Delaney, Manager, Fair Housing Program; Brittany Woolfolk Compliance Officer

**Supervisor(s):** Gustavo F. Velasquez, Director

### **Program Result: Exceeded Expectations**

The Office of Human Rights significantly exceeded four targets, exceeded one target and didn't meet one target for the six performance measures for this goal.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of new docketed cases processed within five business days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	95	95
	Actual	100	100	100	99.44	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of cases transferred to Investigations within 45 calendar days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	50	60	75	75	75
	Actual	100	100	100	98.31	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of District agencies that are trained in EEO policies					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	50	60	75	75	75
	Actual	106	125	133.3	100	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of targeted investigations completed each month					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	75	80	80	80
	Actual	122	96.46	92.7	106.74	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent of annual target of 3000 District residents, workers and employees reached through education and outreach seminars					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	108.7	285.03	-
	Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/22/06).					
Measure 1.6:	Annual average of backlog cases at the end of each month					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	150	150	150
	Actual	N/A	N/A	150.75	85	-
	Note: This KRM is added per agency request. Yearly target is an average over 12 months (2/22/06).					

**Program 2: Agency Management***Supervisor(s):* Gustavo F. Velasquez, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	66.67	46.7	-	-
Measure 2.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	100	85	85.7	83.3	-

## ***Office of Latino Affairs (BZ0)***

### **Program 1: Community-based Grants**

*Manager(s):* Ezequiel Williams

*Supervisor(s):* Mercedes Lemp, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OLA significantly exceeded expectations for both of the targets of the Community-based Grants Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of grantee organizations receiving OLA technical assistance

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	60	70	70
Actual	N/A	53.33	66.7	90.63	-

Note: FY 2006 target decreased from 70 to 60 (2/05). Measure wording changed at agency request. (2/2007)

Measure 1.2: Percent of grantees that have complied with the terms of their grant agreements/contracts

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	85	90	90
Actual	N/A	80.21	95.8	100	-

### **Program 2: Advocacy and Language Access**

*Manager(s):* George Escobar

*Supervisor(s):* Mercedes Lemp, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DC OLA met expectations for the Advocacy Program. Results for one of this program's two measures exceeded expectations; however, progress on LEP Action Plans shows need for improvement.

Measure 2.1: Percent of DC government agencies covered under the Language Access Act (and required to have a Language Access Plan) demonstrating progress toward LAA compliance as a result of OLA assistance and consultation

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	80	90	90
Actual	N/A	67.86	81.8	96	-

Measure 2.2: Number of major community issues advocated for which plans were formulated and actions taken

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	80	90	90
Actual	N/A	70	80	66.67	-

Note: Standard changed from "percent" to "number" to indicate the scope of this measure. Measure name slightly revised at agency request. (2/2007)

### **Program 3: Community Relations and Outreach**

*Manager(s):* Cecilia Arce

*Supervisor(s):* Mercedes Lemp, Director

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the Community Relations and Outreach Program exceeded expectations.

Measure 3.1: Percent of Latino serving organizations with which OLA has an outreach partnership in place

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	60	70	80	80
Actual	N/A	60	72.5	78.95	-

Measure 3.2: Number of vital information issues and Mayoral initiatives that are bilingually written and massively communicated to Latino residents

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	24	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3: Total number of Latinos attending OLA events (Latino Family Fair, Latino Housing Fair, Latino Job Fair, other Latino Mayoral forums)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	20	27	25	20
Actual	N/A	22.22	32.7	64.38	-

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Mercedes Lemp, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.2: Cost of Risk

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.3: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	41	60	-	-

Measure 4.4: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	71.4	87.5	71.4	-

## ***District Department of the Environment (KG0)***

### **Program 1: Direct Services**

*Supervisor(s):* George Hawkins, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The District Department of the Environment significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing the targets for both measures in the Direct Services Program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent average reduction of energy consumption in units weatherized					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	12.28	12.98	12.17	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of eligible households that receive assistance through LIHEAP					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	40	40	40
	Actual	N/A	N/A	43.74	62.24	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Replaces "Percent of households that can better afford their energy bills" (12/13/05).

Measure 1.3:	Percent of DC Public Schools receiving energy efficiency based curriculums and education strategies					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	40	40	40
	Actual	N/A	N/A	38.4	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Replaces "Percent of low income households that have received energy efficiency trainings" (3/11/06). Per agency request, the KRM name is changed from "Percent average reduction in household energy consumption for DCPS students participating in the energy patrol program" (12/27/06).

### **Program 2: Policy and Planning**

*Supervisor(s):* George Hawkins, Director

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The District Department of the Environment exceeded expectations for the Policy and Planning program. Two of the three program's measures significantly surpassed their targets.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of DDOE/ED participants served as a result of Regulatory and Legislative Affairs efforts					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	25	25	25	25
	Actual	N/A	35.4	39.79	32.6	-

Note: Per agency request, the KRM name is changed from "Percent increase in participants in DCEO program" (12/27/06).

Measure 2.2:	Percent of traditional energy offset by renewable energy by DC Government				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	7	2	7	2
Actual	N/A	5.03	3.75	10	-

Note: Target is reduced from 7% to 2% based on issues identified by the Office of Property Management and Office of Procurement concerning the incremental cost of green power over the cost of fossil fuel generated power which will decrease the percentage of green power the agency is able to procure (3/10/06). Per agency request, the words "in DC" is replaced with "by DC Government" in the KRM name (12/27/06).

Measure 2.3:	Percent of ESF-12 ELO's completing trainings and exercises				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	186.32	256	32.86	-

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* George Hawkins, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	4.6	20	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	71.4	86	50	-

## Office of Asian and Pacific Islander Affairs (AP0)

### Program 1: APIA Support Program

Manager(s): Soohyun Koo, Interim Director

Supervisor(s): Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor

### Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

OAPIA met or surpassed all targets for the APIA Support Program.

Measure 1.1:	Number of API participants in mayoral programs such as town hall meetings				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1955
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	1862	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007. Replaces "Percent of API participants in mayoral programs such as town hall meetings." (3/2007)					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of API community-based organizations that demonstrate progress as a result of OAPIA's role				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	7	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007. (3/11/06) FY 2007 is baseline year for data collection. FY 2008 target increased from 4% to 8% at agency request. (1/30/2007)					

Measure 1.3:	Percent increase in API community events with OAPIA participation				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	20	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	20.6	28.32	-
Note: FY 2005 data will be collected as a baseline year for FY 2006 and FY 2007 targets. Although the FY 2006 target was met, targets from FY 2007 on decreased from 20% to 5% at agency request. Maintaining an annual 20% increase is not realistic. (3/2007)					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of API participants reporting satisfaction with services and information received at OAPIA organized events				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	70	70	80
Actual	N/A	98.02	95.9	100	-

Measure 1.5:	Percent of Asian-owned small businesses visited by OAPIA in every D.C. ward				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	40	53	53	60
Actual	N/A	40.2	56.9	53.2	-

Measure 1.6:	Percent increase in resident and merchants cases in which action was taken by OAPIA				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	111	-
Note: New measure in FY 2007. Measure name changed from "Percent of community issues in which action was taken by OAPIA." (3/2007)					

Measure 1.7:	Percent of covered entities under the Language Access Act that demonstrate evident progress as a result of OAPIA's role				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Note: New measure in FY 2007.					

Measure 1.8:	Percent of covered entities under the Language Access Act engaged in OAPIA activities				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	80	-
Note: New measure in FY 2007.					

Measure 1.9:	Percent of vendor translations reviewed for cultural and grammatical accuracy in Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	5	-
Note: New measure in FY 2007.					

**Program 2: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Cost of Risk				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	52	69.6	-	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	73.33	80	85.7	100	-

## Office of Veterans Affairs (VA0)

### Program 1: Veterans Services

Manager(s): Kerwin E. Miller, Director

Supervisor(s): Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff

#### Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OVA significantly exceeded expectations for the Veterans Services Program. All of the targets for this program's three measures were met or surpassed.

Measure 1.1: Percent of veterans who rate OVA services as satisfactory or better

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	90	95	96
Actual	N/A	98.65	100	100	-

Measure 1.2: Number of veterans contacted through outreach programs

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	200	400	600	650
Actual	N/A	200	409	629	-

Note: Measure revised from "Percent of veterans contacted through outreach programs." (3/10/06)

Measure 1.3: Number of veteran events and programs coordinated

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	4	6	8	9
Actual	N/A	6	16	33	-

Note: Measure revised from "Percent of veteran events and programs coordinated" (3/10/06)

### Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Kerwin E. Miller, Director

Supervisor(s): Tene Dolphin, Chief of Staff

#### Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	52.6	82.4	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	75	100	100	-

## Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (JZ0)

### Program 1: Committed Youth Services

Manager(s): David Muhammad, Program Manager

Supervisor(s): Vincent Schiraldi, Director

### Program Result: Meets Expectations

The Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services met expectations for the two reported measures of the Committed Youth Services Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent reduction in re-arrests among committed youth within one year of release into the community

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	50	-	-

Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 baseline Actual is percent of re-arrests within one year. (12/19/2006)

Measure 1.2: Percent reduction in time spent by committed youth at Oak Hill awaiting community or residential placement

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	935	-	-

Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 baseline Actual is average monthly committed youth days. (12/19/2006)

Measure 1.3: Percent increase in the number of committed youth residing in community placements vs. Oak Hill and residential care

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	25
Actual	N/A	N/A	112.6	-	-

Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 baseline Actual is percent of youth in community placement / youth in Oak Hill and residential care. (12/2006) FY 2007 and FY 2008 targets reduced from 50% to 25% at agency request. (3/2007)

Measure 1.4: Percent of cases using family / team meetings for planning

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	50
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: New measure FY 2007. (2/2006) FY 2007 target reduced from 50% to 25% at agency request. (3/2007)

Measure 1.5: Percent reduction of destructive behavior incidents among committed youth at Oak Hill

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	1.07	27.72	-

Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 baseline Actual is incidents per 100 youth days. (12/19/2006)

**Program 2: Detained Services***Manager(s):* Jeffrey McInnis, Program Manager*Supervisor(s):* Vincent Schiraldi, Director**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services significantly exceeded expectations for the two reported measures of the Detained Services Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent reduction of time spent by detained youth in secure detention

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	4241	40.86	-

Note: FY 2006 baseline Actual is the monthly average of secure detention time in days.  
(12/2006) FY 2008 target reduced from 15% to 10% at agency request. (3/2007)

Measure 2.2: Percent increase in use of community placement for youth in pretrial status

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	25	15
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: FY 2008 target reduced from 25% to 15% at agency request. (3/2007)

Measure 2.3: Percent decrease in use of secure detention beds

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	15
Actual	N/A	N/A	4040	-	-

Note: FY 2006 baseline Actual is the monthly average number of secure detention days.  
(12/19/2006)

Measure 2.4: Percent reduction of re-arrests of youth under DYRS community detention supervision

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	10.2	40.63	-

Note: FY 2006 baseline Actual is percent of re-arrested youth. (12/2006) FY 2007 target reduced from 15% to 10% and FY 2008 target reduced from 15% to 5% at agency request. (3/2007)

**Program 3: Agency Management***Manager(s):* Barry Holman, Program Manager*Supervisor(s):* Vincent Schiraldi, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1: Percent of Mayor's Customer Service Standards met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	16.7	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	80	-



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter F: Public Works**

**March 2008**

---

## ***Department of Public Works (KT0)***

### **Program 1: Sanitation Services**

*Manager(s):* Tom Henderson, Solid Waste Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* William Howland, Director

### **Program Result: *Met Expectations***

DC DPW met expectations for the Sanitation Services Program. This program contains eight measures. The target for four measures were exceeded and the other four measures showed need for improvement. Overall, the Sanitation Services Program achieved an overall rating of met expectations.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of Clean city areas rated "clean" or "moderately" clean					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	85	85	88	90	90
	Actual	90.3	82.84	84.55	-	-
	Note: The KRM's name is changed from "Percent of D.C. gateways, commercial and residential areas rated clean or moderately clean" per agency request. FY 2006-2007 targets increased from 85 to 88 and 90, respectively, at request of the agency (2/14/06).					
Measure 1.2:	Percent of bulk pick-up collections within 10 days of customer request					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	97	97	97	97	97
	Actual	96.8	99.21	99.11	99.82	-
	Note: The KRM's name is changed from "Percent of bulk pick-ups collected within 10 days of customer's request" per agency request (2/14/06).					
Measure 1.3:	Percent of waste transferred from the municipal transfer stations within the same business day					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	98	98	98
	Actual	99.3	99.28	98.35	100.56	-
	Note: The KRM's name is changed from "Percent of waste transferred within the same business day" per agency request (2/14/06).					
Measure 1.4:	Percent of sanitation enforcement requests resolved within 5 business days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	80	85	85	85	85
	Actual	89	90.04	98.04	98.28	-
	Note: The FY 2007 and 2008 targets are reduced from 90% to 85% at request from agency. The word "investigated" in the earlier KRM's title is changed to "resolved" per agency request (2/14/06).					
Measure 1.5:	Percent of trash collection routes completed on scheduled day					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8
	Actual	99.3	99.24	98.88	99.6	-
	Note: The KRM's name is changed from "Percent of scheduled trash collected on same day" per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 1.6:	Percent of residential solid waste diverted for recycling				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	20	20	22	25	30
Actual	13.6	17.1	19.99	17.55	-

Measure 1.7:	Percent of signed street sweeping routes cleaned on schedule				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	86.2	90.16	84.09	92.62	-

Measure 1.8:	Percent of residential recycling collection routes completed on scheduled day				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	99.8	99.8	99.8
Actual	N/A	N/A	98.81	99.45	-
Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 1.9:	Percent of scheduled bulk appointments collected on time				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	98	98	98
Actual	N/A	N/A	99.11	99.81	-
Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

**Program 2: Parking Services**

*Manager(s):* Teri Adams, Parking Services Program Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* William Howland, Director

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

Overall, DC DPW met expectations for the Parking Services Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of residential parking enforcement service requests responded to within 24 hours				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	98	98	98
Actual	N/A	N/A	98.08	98.78	-
Note: Replaces "Percent of residential parking enforcement service requests responded to within 48 hours." The agency will measure responsiveness within 2 hours beginning in FY 2008. (2/14/06)					

Measure 2.2:	Percent of reported abandoned vehicles on public space removed within 5 business days				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	90.68	78.3	-
Note: Replaces "Percent of reported abandoned vehicles on public space removed within 13 business days" (2/14/06)					

Measure 2.3: Percent of private sector tow trucks responding to the scene within 45 minutes of dispatch

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	75	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	77.06	75.17	-

Note: Replaces "Percent of private sector tow trucks responding to the scene within 30 minutes of dispatch" (2/14/06). Per agency request the targets for FY 2007 onwards in increased from 75% to 85% (2/27/07).

Measure 2.4: Percent of residential parking permit (RPP) blocks covered by daily parking enforcement

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	50
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	21.79	-

Note: New measure in FY 2007.

### **Program 3: Fleet Management**

*Manager(s):* Patricia Robinson, Fleet Management Program Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* William Howland, Director

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

DC DPW exceeded expectations for the five measures within the Fleet Management Program.

Measure 3.1: Percent compliance with preventive maintenance scheduled appointments

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	85	95	95
Actual	77.6	78.18	82.82	76.87	-

Note: FY 2005 and FY 2006 targets reduced to 80 from 83 and 85 respectively per request of agency (1/12/05). The FY 2007 target is increased from 85% to 95% and the measure's title is revised from "Percent of scheduled preventive maintenance completed monthly" (2/14/06).

Measure 3.2: Percent of mission critical DPW fleet available for daily operations

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	98	95	95	95	95
Actual	92.8	95.87	96.08	109.7	-

Note: FY 2005 and FY 2006 targets reduced from 98 to 95 at request of agency (1/12/04). The word "fleet" in the measure's title is replaced with "DPW fleet" per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 3.3: Percent of DPW mission critical fleet within useful lifecycle

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	95	97	97	95	95
Actual	95.3	96.36	97.76	97.48	-

Note: FY 2005 target reduced from 99 to 97 at request of the agency (1/9/04). Per agency request, the KRM title is revised from "Percent of mission critical fleet within useful life cycle, based on industry standards" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 97% to 95% (2/14/06).

Measure 3.4:	Percent of fuel pumps available for daily use	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	98	99	98	99	99
	Actual	98.8	98.22	96.81	91.28	-

Note: Measure title modified from, "percent of days each year in which conventional and alternative fuels are available" in FY 2004. The word "use" is replaced with "daily use" per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 3.5:	Percent of repeat repairs within 2 business days	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	1.7	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* William Howland, Director

*Supervisor(s):* William Howland, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	66.67	63	-	-

Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	64.71	80	94	44.4	-

Measure 4.5:	Percent of DPW personnel attending at least one training program during the fiscal year	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	80	80	80	80
	Actual	56.7	66	96	-	-

## ***District Department of Transportation (KA0)***

### **Program 1: Infrastructure Development and Maintenance**

**Manager(s):** Kathleen Penney, Chief Engineer/Associate Director IPMA; Soumya Dey, Acting Associate Director; John Thomas, Supervisory Arborist

**Supervisor(s):** Emeka C. Moneme, Agency Director

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, DDOT exceeded expectations for the Infrastructure and Development Maintenance Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of DDOT design and planning projects completed with no more than 10% DDOT-initiated cost escalation and with no more than 60 days delay from the budgetary and calendar projections at the time the project begins

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.2: Percent of DDOT construction projects completed with no more than 10% DDOT-initiated cost escalation & no more than 60 days delay from budgetary and calendar projections at the time the project begins

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	78	90.16	96.3	-	-

Note: FY 2007 measure wording changed ("DDOT-initiated") at agency request. (2/2007)

Measure 1.3: Percent of bid responses within 10 percent of engineer's estimate

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	41	30	66.7	46.67	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of projects requiring no change orders due to design deficiency or latent conditions

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	90
Actual	80	82.26	81.3	95.12	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of projects requiring no change orders due to DDOT-initiated change of scope

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.6: Percent of streets rated good or excellent on the Pavement Quality Index

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	72	72	72	72	63
Actual	79.17	72.73	-	78.76	-

Note: Pavement quality data is updated every two years. Measure slightly reworded at agency request. (2/2007)

Measure 1.7:	Percent of pothole complaints resolved within 48 hours					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	97	98.63	99.4	99.95	-
	Note: Timeframe changed from 72 to 48 hours after DDOT's initial CapStat session. (1/2007)					
Measure 1.8:	Rate of pothole complaints per mile maintained					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	6.3	6.3	5.8	5.8	5.8
	Actual	4.65	4.85	3.39	5.7	-
Measure 1.9:	Miles of residential pavements preserved by fabric, chip seal and slurry					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	60	60
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007.					
Measure 1.10:	Percent of trees interacted with (planted, trimmed or removed) per year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	21	21	21	21	24.5
	Actual	19.1	20.32	25.3	31.67	-
Measure 1.11:	Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	2	2	2	2	1.5
	Actual	1.38	1.04	1.06	0.12	-
Measure 1.12:	Percent change in fatalities: current year vs. 5-year rolling average					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4	-4
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. In general, DC has a small number of fatalities and they can vary greatly by year. This measure will put our performance in the context of the past five years and normalize dramatic variations.					
Measure 1.13:	Percent change in injuries and traffic crashes: current year vs. 5-year rolling average.					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4	-4
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-10.68	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. Crashes can also vary greatly by year. This edited measure will put our performance in the context of the past five years and normalize the					
Measure 1.14:	Percent decrease in pedestrian fatalities and injuries from preceding year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-4	-4	-4	-2	-2.78
	Actual	N/A	N/A	10	-2.44	-
	Note: Previously Measure 1.10: Percent change in fatalities and crash-related injuries. DDOT also tracks pedestrian fatalities and injuries per 100,000 daytime population. For all of FY 2006 this figure was 70.8. FY 2007 and 2008 targets reduced from -4% to -2% at agency request. (2/2007)					

Measure 1.15:	Percent of streetlights repaired within established timeframes				
	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	89	85.52	96.2	75.96	-

Measure 1.16: If freezing rain/ice, percent of major and residential streets passable within 10 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007. For greater precision, this and the following 6 measures replace "Percent of major streets passable within 12 hours after a snow event."

Measure 1.17: If snow up to 2", percent of major streets passable within 4 hours, and residential streets passable within 6 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.88	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.18: If snow 2" to 4", percent of major streets passable within 6 hours, and residential streets passable within 8 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.19: If snow 4" to 8", percent of major streets passable within 12 hours, and residential streets passable within 24 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	85
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.20: If snow 8" to 12", percent of major streets passable within 18 hours, and residential streets passable within 18-36 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	85
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.21: If snow 12" to 18", percent of major streets passable within 24 to 36 hours, and residential streets passable within 48 hours after a snow event

		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	75	75
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

Measure 1.22: If snow over 18", percent of major streets passable within 36 hours, and residential streets passable within 60 hours after a snow event

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	75	75
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: New measure for FY 2007.

**Program 2: Transportation Operations**

**Manager(s):** Soumya Dey, Acting Associate Director TOA; Karina Ricks TPPA, Associate Director; Freddie Fuller, Associate Director MTA; Ann Simpson-Mason, Acting Deputy Director PSMA

**Supervisor(s):** Emeka C. Moneme, Agency Director

**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DDOT met expectations on six targets and did not meet expectations on three targets for the nine Key Result Measures for the Transportation Operations program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of excavation permittees completing projects within 45-day timeframe

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	85	85	85	85
Actual	97	89.98	87.6	88.83	-

Note: Replaces "Percent of excavation permits in compliance." (2/2007)

Measure 2.2: Percent of malfunctioning signals repaired in 24 hours

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	85	85	85	85	85
Actual	93	93.92	93.7	98.61	-

Note: FY 2004-2006 targets increased from 80 to 85 at the request of the agency (2/2004). Measure wording changed at the request of the agency. (5/2004) Measure wording revised for clarity. (2/2007)

Measure 2.3: Percent of damaged stop or yield signs replaced in 24 hours

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	100	94	96	96	96
Actual	100	98.48	100	-	-

Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency. (5/2004) Measure wording revised for clarity. (2/2007)

Measure 2.4: Percent change in mass transit ridership

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Actual	1.51	2.56	-2.62	-78.57	-

Note: FY 2004-2006 targets changed from 3 to 1.5 at the request of the agency (2/04).

Measure 2.5: Average hourly number of weekday bicyclists counted at 30+ counting stations

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	30.42	31.94
Actual	N/A	6.65	5	22	-

Note: New measure in FY 2005. FY 2005 and 2006 targets are TBD. For FY 2007 measure revised from "Percent change in the number of bicycle commuters." In FY 2006 there was an hourly average of 28.97 bicyclists. (2/2007)

Measure 2.6:	Increased miles of bicycle lanes and routes in the District					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007.					

Measure 2.7:	Percentage of Streetcar (Anacostia phase 1) complete and operational by end FY 2007					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. If achieved, this measure will be removed for FY 2008.					

Measure 2.8:	Percentage of Rapid Bus complete and operational					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets refer to 50% of the Georgia Avenue route (FY 2007) and 100% of the Georgia and Pennsylvania Avenue routes (FY 2008). If achieved, this measure will be removed for FY 2009.					

Measure 2.9:	Percentage change in Circulator ridership					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	21.1	-
	Note: New measure. Baseline data will be collected during FY 2007.					

**Program 3: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Emeka C. Moneme, Agency Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	66.7	79.2	-	-

Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	64.71	87.5	76.5	62.5	-

## ***Department of Motor Vehicles (KV0)***

### **Program 1: Adjudication Services**

*Manager(s):* Wanda Butler, Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

### **Program Result: *Met Expectations***

DMV met the target for one of the measures and did not meet targets for the other two measures. Overall, the Adjudication Services Program was rated as met expectations.

Measure 1.1: Percent of mail adjudication parking hearings completed within 90 days of request

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	75	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	45.17	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target changed from 80% to N/A at the agency's request that the measure is to be revised in FY 2007. Agency did not submit any FY 2006 data (10/12/2006). At the agency's request the measure is revised from "Percent of adjudication services completed in one visit" (2/28/2007).

Measure 1.2: Percent of mail adjudication photo enforcement hearings completed within 90 days of request

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	91.04	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target changed from 85% to N/A at the agency's request that the measure is to be revised in FY 2007. Agency did not submit any FY 2006 data (10/12/2006). At the agency request the measure is revised from "Percent of adjudication services completed within 50 minutes or less" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 85% (2/28/2007).

Measure 1.3: Percent increase of on-line ticket and fee payments

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	8	8	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	57.01	7	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. Target indicates increase over previous year's actual.

### **Program 2: Vehicle Services**

*Manager(s):* Kenneth Edmonson, Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

### **Program Result: *Needs Improvement***

DMV surpassed one of its targets and didn't meet the other two targets. Overall, the rating for Vehicle Services is needs improvement.

Measure 2.1: Percent of the number of vehicle registration transactions completed within 40 minutes or less

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	35	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	95.81	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target changed from 38% to "N/A" at the agency request that the measure is to be revised in FY 2007. Agency did not submit any FY 2006 data (10/12/2006). At the agency request, the measure is revised from "Percent reduction in the number of required vehicle services visits over FY 2004 base year" and the FY 2007 target is increased from 62% (2/28/2007).

Measure 2.2: Percent increase in the number of vehicle registration renewals processed online, over prior fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	25	8	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	16.72	4.42	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. Per agency, the measure is to be revised in FY 2007 (10/12/2006). At the agency's request, the measure is revised from "Percent increase in the number of vehicle services obtained online, over prior fiscal year" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 25% (2/28/2007).

Measure 2.3: Percent of vehicle inspections completed within 10 minutes or less

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target changed from 95% to "N/A" at the agency request that the measure is to be revised in FY 2007. Agency did not submit any FY 2006 data (10/12/2006). At the agency's request, the measure is revised from "Percent of inspection lanes available during service hours" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 95%. The revised measure does not include wait times which currently cannot be measured (2/28/2007).

### **Program 3: Driver Services**

*Manager(s):* Joan Saleh, Administrator

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

### **Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

DMV surpassed one of the targets and didn't meet the other one for the two Key Result Measures for the Driver Services program.

Measure 3.1: Percent increase in the number of driver's license and identification card renewals obtained online, over prior fiscal year

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	50	25	8	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	44.62	-12	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. Per agency, the measure is to be revised in FY 2007 (10/12/2006). At the agency request, the measure is revised from "Percent increase in the number of driver services obtained on-line, over prior fiscal year" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 25% (2/28/2007).

Measure 3.2: Percent of driver's license and identification card transactions completed within 40 minutes or less

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	94.72	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target changed from 85% to "N/A" at the agency's request that the measure is to be revised in FY 2007. Agency did not submit any FY 2006 data (10/12/2006). At the agency request, the measure is revised from "Percent of driver's services visits completed within 50 minutes or less" and the FY 2007 target is reduced from 85% (2/28/2007).

**Program 4: Business Services**

*Manager(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DMV significantly exceed expectations for the two measures associated with the Business Services Program.

Measure 4.1: Percent of commercial driver's license, taxi, and limo transactions completed within 40 minutes or less

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	85	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.03	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. The agency requested that the measure be revised in FY 2007 (12/29/06). At the agency request, the measure is revised from "Percent of business services requests completed within 50 minutes or less" and the FY 2007 status reduced from 85% (2/28/2007).

Measure 4.2: Percent of dealership bulk work processed within 10 business days or less

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.16	-

Note: The FY 2007 target is change from "N/A", per agency request (3/5/2007).

**Program 5: Customer Contact Services**

*Manager(s):* Carolyn Peery, Associate Director

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

**Program Result:** *Needs Improvement*

DMV needs improvement in the performance for the Customer Contact Services program. The agency surpassed one target but failed to meet two other targets for the three Key Result Measures (KRM) in this program for FY 2007.

Measure 5.1: Percent of all calls to agency call center answered within 2.5 minutes

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	96.4	0	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. Data is missing due to the inability to capture data using antiquated system. DMV worked with OCTO to implement a new call system capable of data reporting.

Measure 5.2: Percent of all agency correspondence (US mail and E-mail) answered within two business days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	85	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	55.46	69.34	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2007 and 2008 targets are reduced from 85%, per agency request (2/28/2007).

Measure 5.3: Percent of all employees that have received customer service training

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	0	93.4	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. FY 2006 target decreased from 95 to 90 per agency request (2/21/05).

**Program 6: Service Integrity**

*Manager(s):* Gabriel Robinson, Service Integrity Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

**Program Result: Below Expectations**

DMV did not meet either of the two targets for the Service Integrity Program.

Measure 6.1: Percent of random audits conducted of all DMV transactions

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	3	4	4	4
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. The Auditor position was advertised in FY07, but there were no qualified candidates. The position has been reclassified and reposted for hire in FY08.

Measure 6.2: Percent of Driver/Vehicle Administration employees trained in fraud detection

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	80	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	18.49	-

Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005. Fraud detection training is being done in conjunction with REAL ID for which the rules have yet to be published. Therefore, training has been delayed.

**Program 7: Technology Services**

*Manager(s):* Libby Clapp, Chief Information Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Lucinda Babers, Director

**Program Result: Met Expectations**

DMV failed to meet one target for the two Key Result Measures in the Technology Services program. Overall, the agency met expectations for this program.

Measure 7.1:	Percent increase in the number of transactions available on-line, over prior fiscal year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	8	4	4
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-12.7	4.5	-
	Note: New Key Result Measure in FY 2005.					

Measure 7.2:	Percent of all system scheduled outages that last less than 30 minutes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	100	100	90	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	58.82	-
	Note: FY 2007 and 2008 targets are reduced from 100%, per agency request (2/28/2007).					

**Program 8: Agency Management**  
**Supervisor(s):** Lucinda Babers, Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 8.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 8.2:	Cost of Risk					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 8.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	42.3	-	-

Measure 8.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	66.67	N/A	50	35.3	-

## ***DC Taxicab Commission (TC0)***

### **Program 1: Licensing and Dispute Resolution**

*Supervisor(s):* Leon Swain, Chairperson

#### **Program Result:** *Does Not Meet Expectations*

The DC Taxicab Commission fell below target of both measures for the Licensing and Dispute Resolution.

Measure 1.1: Percent of public vehicles for hire operators in the District that have obtained an operating license in one business day

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0.23	-

Measure 1.2: Percent of passenger complaints whose grievances are received and acknowledged in 15 days

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	95	100	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	68.68	-

### **Program 2: Passenger and Driver Protection**

*Supervisor(s):* Leon Swain, Chairperson

#### **Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The DC Taxicab Commission surpassed its target for the Passenger and Driver Protection Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of taxicabs and limousines inspected that have valid licenses, insurance and safety inspection stickers

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	90	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	98.41	-

### **Program 3: Agency Management**

*Supervisor(s):* Leon Swain, Chairperson

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2: Cost of Risk

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	7.4	4.2	-	-
Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	33.3	-

## ***Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission (KC0)***

**Program 1:** Promote cooperation with regional, federal, and private organizations.

*Manager(s):* Renee A. Bodden, Office Manager

*Supervisor(s):* William S. Morrow, Jr, Executive Director

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has reported no FY 2007 data.

Measure 1.1: Number of certified carriers

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	360	360	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	393	410	422	-	-

Measure 1.2: Number of formal cases handled, which can include applications for certificate of authority, insurance requirements, and formal complaints against drivers

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	300	300	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	413	362	473	-	-

Measure 1.3: Number of commission orders prepared for issues such as conditional operating licenses and operation suspensions.

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	575	575	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	841	715	909	-	-

## ***Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (KE0)***

**Program 1:**     **The department will increase the number of trips taken, within the District of Columbia, using alternative means of transportation, including mass transit, pedestrian, bicycle and high-occupancy vehicles by 15 percent by 2007 (3% per year).**

*Manager(s):*     Emmanuel Onyekwere, Economic Analyst

*Supervisor(s):*     Freddie Fuller II, Administrator of Office of Mass Transit

**Program Result:**     *Met Expectations*

Measure 1.1:	Percent change in transit ridership over prior year					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	1	1	1	1	1
	Actual	1.8	1.8	-	-1.9	-

Measure 1.2:	Number of dollars provided (millions)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	165.2	171	191	198.4	208
	Actual	162.6	166.6	187.6	198.4	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 174 to 191 at agency request (2/16/05). FY 2007 target increased from \$195 to \$198 at agency request (2/2006).					

Measure 1.3:	Number of dollars requested by WMATA (millions)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	167	177.9	180	185	194
	Actual	162.6	166.6	175.8	185	-
	Note: WMATA modified its FY 2006 target from 178 to 180 (2/16/05). FY 2007 target decreased from \$190 to \$185 at agency request (2/2006).					

Measure 1.4:	Cost to monitor each \$10 million of subsidy					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	23000	23000	37000	37900	25707
	Actual	23422	28106	32258	38919	-
	Note: WMATA modified its FY 2006 target from 23,770 to 37,000 due to new projects (3/14/06).					



**District of Columbia**

**FY 2007 Performance  
Accountability Reports**

**Chapter G: Enterprise and Other Funds**

**March 2008**

---

## ***Water and Sewer Authority (LA0)***

### **Program 1: Provide the highest quality service to our customers.**

*Manager(s):* Charles Kiely, Assistant General Manager, Consumer Services

*Supervisor(s):* Jerry Johnson, General Manager

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

WASA exceeded two of the three targets associated with providing the highest quality service to customers.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of meter-reading accuracy					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
	Actual	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.6	

Measure 1.2:	Percentage of all calls answered within 40 seconds (non peak)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	85	85	85	85
	Actual	N/A	82	88	88	-

Measure 1.3:	Number of days to resolve correspondence					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	30	30	30	30	15
	Actual	34	30	20	6	-

### **Program 2: Provide reliable, high-quality drinking water to customers.**

*Manager(s):* John Dunn, Chief Engineer

*Supervisor(s):* Jerry Johnson, General Manager

#### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

WASA met or surpassed all of the targets except for one.

Measure 2.1:	Percentage of time that drinking water complies with EPA quality requirements					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	92	100	100	-

Measure 2.2:	Number of distribution system miles that are flushed					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	500	500	500	500	500
	Actual	597	1278	588	611	-

Measure 2.3:	Percentage of water main breaks that receive an initial response within 45 minutes					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95	95	95	95	90
	Actual	59	66	74	80	-

Measure 2.4:	Percentage of water main breaks that are repaired within 10 days					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	90	90	90	90	90
	Actual	78	84	73	87	-

**Program 3: Provide high-quality wastewater treatment services to customers.**

*Manager(s):* John Dunn, Chief Engineer

*Supervisor(s):* Jerry Johnson, General Manager

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

WASA met the target for the lone measure associated with providing high-quality wastewater treatment services to customers.

Measure 3.1:	Percentage of time that the agency fully complies with the requirements of the EPA permit addressing the operation and maintenance of wastewater systems					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-

**Program 4: Ensure that WASA's financial performance meets the expectations of the Board of Directors, customers, and the broader financial**

*Manager(s):* Olu Adebo, Acting Chief Financial Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Jerry Johnson, General Manager

**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

WASA exceeded both of its targets regarding financial performance.

Measure 4.1:	Percentage of senior debt service coverage					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	140	140	140	140	140
	Actual	460	562	624	343	-

Measure 4.2:	Amount of operating cash reserves maintained for 180 days worth of operating and maintenance (O&M) expenses (\$ in millions)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	95.5	97.7	102.4	111.3	118.6
	Actual	106.4	116.3	118.7	116.7	-
	Note: The agency modified its FY 2007 target from 101.5 to 111.3 (01/07)					

## ***Washington Aqueduct (LB0)***

### **Program 1: Provide an adequate supply of potable water**

**Manager(s):** Lloyd D. Stowe, Chief, Plant Operations, Washington Aqueduct, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Supervisor(s):** Thomas P. Jacobus, Chief, Washington Aqueduct, U.S

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

Washington Aqueduct has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Number of days water is provided as demanded by Washington, DC				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	365	365	365	365
	Actual	365	365	365	-

Measure 1.2:	Number of days water is provided as demanded by Arlington County, VA				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	365	365	365	365
	Actual	365	365	365	-

Measure 1.3:	Number of days water is provided as demanded by Falls Church, VA				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	365	365	365	365
	Actual	365	365	365	-

Measure 1.4:	Days Average Filtered Water Turbidity is less than .1 NTU				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	346	346	346	346
	Actual	358	346	362	-

### **Program 2: Protect the drinking water consumer from both microbial risk and adverse health effects due to chemicals in the drinking water**

**Manager(s):** Elizabeth Turner, Chief, Laboratory Section, Washington Aqueduct, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Supervisor(s):** Thomas P. Jacobus, Chief, Washington Aqueduct, U.S

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

Washington Aqueduct has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1:	Percentage of treated water samples in compliance with regulatory requirements				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.2:	Number of chemical substances investigated for presence in the water supply system-wide				
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>
	Target	163	163	163	163
	Actual	181	178	177	-
	Note: FY 2006 target decreased from 182 to 163 at the request of the agency (1/04).				

Measure 2.3: Number of months per year EPA water quality report is completed by the tenth of the month

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	10	10	10	10	10
Actual	11	12	12	-	-

Measure 2.4: Number of months per year required bacteriological samples are analyzed within holding times and with appropriate quality control

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	12	12	12	12	12
Actual	12	12	12	-	-

Measure 2.5: Number of months per year required chemical samples are analyzed within holding times and with appropriate quality control

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	12	12	12	12	12
Actual	12	12	12	-	-

## ***D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board (DC0)***

### **Program 1: Gaming Operations**

**Supervisor(s):** Jeanette A. Michael, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board (DC0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1: Percent change in lottery tickets sold

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	2	5	2	2
Actual	N/A	-4	14.09	-	-

Note: FY 2006 target changed from 3% to 5%. FY 2007-2008 targets reduced from 3% to 2%. (3/10/06)

Measure 1.2: Percent of eligible agents who achieve year-over-year target level growth

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	95	90	95	95
Actual	N/A	70	92.67	-	-

Note: FY 2006 target is changed from 95% at the agency request (8/7/2006).

### **Program 2: Instant Games**

**Supervisor(s):** Jeanette A. Michael, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board (DC0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1: Percentage of transfer target met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	93	86.38	-	-

Note: FY 2005-2007 targets modified from 15 to 100.

### **Program 3: On-Line Gaming Operations**

**Supervisor(s):** Jeanette A. Michael, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board (DC0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1: On-line games - percent of transfer target met

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	94	103.32	-	-

### **Program 4: Agency Management**

**Supervisor(s):** Jeanette A. Michael, Executive Director

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board (DC0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	35	46	-	-
Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	20	60	-	-

## ***Sports and Entertainment Commission (SC0)***

### **Program 1: Increase the number of events held at the agency's facilities**

*Manager(s):* Ollie Harper, Jr., Director of Facility Operations

*Supervisor(s):* Gregory A. O'Dell, Chief Executive Officer

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Sports and Entertainment Commission has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Number of Stadium and Armory events					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	73	100	115	115	115
	Actual	93	N/A	135	-	-

### **Program 2: Become more profitable**

*Manager(s):* Wilma G. Matthias, Chief Financial Officer

*Supervisor(s):* Gregory A. O'Dell, Chief Executive Officer

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Sports and Entertainment Commission has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 2.1:	Net income from stadium and armory events (thousands of dollars)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	-2523	-2184	261	261	261
	Actual	N/A	N/A	1034	-	-

### **Program 3: Improve community outreach program**

*Manager(s):* Scott Burrell, Director of Special Projects

*Supervisor(s):* Gregory A. O'Dell, Chief Executive Officer

#### **Program Result:** *No Rating*

The Sports and Entertainment Commission has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 3.1:	Community outreach contribution (thousands of dollars)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	116	N/A	176	-	-

## ***District of Columbia Retirement Board (DY0)***

**Program 1:**     **Achieve long-term rate of return in excess of the actuarially assumed rate of return.**

*Manager(s):*     Eric O. Stanchfield, Executive Director

*Supervisor(s):*   District of Columbia Retirement Board of Trustees

**Program Result:**   *Met Expectations*

The District of Columbia Retirement Board met expectations for this Program. Targets for two of three measures were met or surpassed.

Measure 1.1:     Achieve a long-term rate of return in excess of the actuarially assumed rate of return

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25
Actual	9.2	8.8	8.70	7.90	-

Note: The actuarially assumed rate of return was changed from 7.25% to 7.50% at the November 15, 2007, Board meeting. The new actuarial rate will become effective for FY 2009.

Measure 1.2:     Percent of timely and accurate benefit payments to the retirees and their survivors

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	73	61	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006.

Measure 1.3:     Percent of vendor payments made on a timely basis to minimize interest penalties

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	N/A	99	99	99
Actual	N/A	N/A	99	100	-

Note: DCRB did not pay any interest penalties to vendors in FY 2007.

## ***Washington Convention Center Authority (ES0)***

**Program 1:** Maintain or exceed bookings and building revenue in the new convention center.

*Manager(s):* Pia Brown, Director of Event Management

*Supervisor(s):* Reba Pittman Walker, Acting General Manager

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

Washington Convention Center Authority (ES0) has reported no FY 2007 performance data.

Measure 1.1:	Number of events hosted					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	161	170	120	120	N/A
	Actual	201	N/A	106	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Operating revenue generated (millions)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	15.6	15.5	15.5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	16.1	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Convention center occupancy rate (percentage)					
		<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	75	75	75	75	N/A
	Actual	81	N/A	64	-	-

## ***University of the District of Columbia (GF0)***

### **Program 1: Academic Affairs**

**Manager(s):** Bertha D. Minus

**Supervisor(s):** Stanley Jackson, Acting President

### **Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The University of the District of Columbia exceeded expectations for the Academic Affairs Program.

The Key Result Measures integrate data from each of UDC's academic programs.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of applicants receiving notification of admission within 10 business days after receipt of completed application	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	80	80	93
	Actual	N/A	100	100	90	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of students retained from year to year	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	27	33	33	53
	Actual	N/A	57.98	52.1	50	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of students completing baccalaureate degree requirements within the targeted timeframes	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	25	30	30	22
	Actual	N/A	22.86	52	19.2	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of graduates employed within their field of study within twelve months of graduation	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	10	15	15	58
	Actual	N/A	71.99	78.5	55.4	-
	Note: Measure modified from 6 months to 12 months. (2/16/05)					
Measure 1.5:	Percent of graduates matriculating into post-graduate programs or institutions within twelve months of graduation	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	10	10	17
	Actual	N/A	13.82	19.1	14.5	-
	Note: Measure modified from 6 months to 12 months. (2/16/05)					
Measure 1.6:	Percent pass rate for professional licensing or certificate	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	80	80	75
	Actual	N/A	67.14	71.3	69.3	-

Measure 1.7: Percent of adult learners who progress annually by at least one grade level in reading or mathematics

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	85	90	90	57
Actual	N/A	47.92	41.6	54.9	-

Note: Modified from "Percent of adult learners served by Community-Based Organizations who can read and write." Targets adjusted accordingly. (5/2007)

Measure 1.8: Percent of programs meeting accreditation requirements

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	70	80	80	80
Actual	N/A	83.72	84	81.4	-

Measure 1.9: Percent of faculty engaged in active research, publication or public service projects

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	15	15	65
Actual	N/A	60.28	59.9	63.6	-

Measure 1.10: Percent of research proposals resulting in Memoranda of Agreement

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	20	25	25	39
Actual	N/A	27.5	37.5	57.1	-

**Program 2: Student Affairs**

*Manager(s):* Borlandoe Janice

*Supervisor(s):* Stanley Jackson, Acting President

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the University of the District of Columbia exceeded expectations for the Student Affairs Program.

Measure 2.1: Percent of UDC student body participating in formal leadership development activities

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	12	15	18	30
Actual	N/A	16.74	22.1	27.3	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of Career Services clients securing employment or other post-graduate opportunity of choice within six months of graduation

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	10	15	20	49
Actual	N/A	7.11	34.1	48	-

Measure 2.3: Percent of students that access or receive one or more non-required Student Life services

	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
Target	N/A	18	20	25	65
Actual	N/A	43.51	123	63	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of students who gain access to the University through an athletic opportunity	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	6	8	10
	Actual	N/A	1.69	7.1	1.5	-
	Note: FY 2007 and 2008 targets increased from 6% to 8% and 10% at UDC request. (1/2007)					

Measure 2.5:	Percent of financial aid applications (submitted complete and timely) processed by the start of school	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	30	32	34	60
	Actual	N/A	56.18	57.3	58	-

Measure 2.6:	Percent of students (26 yrs of age and under) whose immunization status has been assessed	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	65	75	80	95
	Actual	N/A	86.5	80.9	95	-

Measure 2.7:	Percent of students who access or receive one or more career services reporting satisfaction	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Measure 2.8:	Percent of students who report satisfaction with one or more non-required counseling services	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Measure 2.9:	Percent of students who report satisfaction with utilization of services for students with disabilities	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

**Program 3: University Relations**  
**Manager(s):** Bobby Austin  
**Supervisor(s):** Stanley Jackson, Acting President

**Program Result:** *Exceeded Expectations*

The University of the District of Columbia exceeded expectations for this program.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of UDC alumni (including alumni of predecessor institutions) contributing funds	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	1	1.5	1.5	5.0
	Actual	N/A	20.6	1.61	4.7	-

Measure 3.2:	Dollar amount of non-alumni donations made	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	430,500	452,000	452,000	452,000
	Actual	N/A	468,725	617,713	399,000	-

Measure 3.3:	Frequency of positive articles, segments, and RTF reports about the University, its students, faculty, staff and alumni evidenced in DC media	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	8	12	12	60
	Actual	N/A	37	13	57	-
	Note: FY 2005 target is eight annually or two per quarter. FY 2006 target is 12 or three per quarter.					

**Program 4: Agency Management**

*Manager(s):* Stanley Jackson, Acting President

*Supervisor(s):* Stanley Jackson, Acting President

**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	6	9	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	73.7	85	73.7	-